DG
W69

Central BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

PRESENTED BY
THE AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICTION SOCIETY

DG
W69
1 Copy
c 2

A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament

By

ROBERT DICK WILSON

PH. D., D.D.,

Professor of Semitic Philology in Princeton Theological Seminary

PHILADELPHIA

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL TIMES COMPANY

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

COPYRIGHT, 1926, BY

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL TIMES COMPANY

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

221.13
W752

PREFACE

IT IS the purpose of the present volume to show that intelligent Christians have a reasonable ground for concluding that the text of the Old Testament which we have is substantially correct, and that, in its true and obvious meaning, it has a right to be considered a part of the "infallible rule of faith and practice" that we have in the Holy Scriptures.

I have not gone into a discussion of miracles and prophecy, either as to their possibility or as to their actuality. All believers in the incarnation and the resurrection must accept this possibility and this actuality. I seek rather to show that, so far as anyone *knows,* the Old Testament can be and is just what the authors claimed it to be, and what the Christ and the New Testament writers thought it to be. The theory of *kenosis,* so far as it affects the Lord's knowledge of the Old Testament, is, I hope, shown to be unnecessary, because the facts and the evidence bearing upon the Old Testament support the testimony of Jesus.

I have not said much about the chronology and the geography of the Old Testament, because in neither of these two departments of history are the facts and the evidence sufficiently well established to give us re-

16887

liable testimony upon the details of the Biblical records as they bear upon these two important subjects.

As to the first chapters of Genesis, the extra-Biblical sources now known show that before the time of Abraham the minds of men were much occupied with the origin of the universe; and also, that the account in Genesis is the only one which is clearly monotheistic, and that it is incomparably superior in rationality to the ten or more accounts from Egypt and Babylonia. The Babylonian account of the flood confirms the probability that the Biblical records describe a real historical occurrence and, as Professor Sayce said long ago, shows by its similar combination of the so-called J and P documents of the Pentateuch that the radical hypothesis of the post-captivity composition of the Biblical record of the deluge is absolutely contrary to the facts. The time, the extent, and many of the circumstances of the flood are still debatable; but that there was a flood before the time of Abraham and that the Genesis account of it is correct is abundantly supported in substance by the evidence of the eleventh tablet of the Babylonian record.

The method followed may be called the evidential method; because I have sought to follow the Laws of Evidence as applied to documents admitted in our courts of law. I presume that the *prima facie* evidence of the documents of the Old Testament is to be received as true until it shall have been proved false. I hold, further, that the evidence of manuscripts and

versions and of the Egyptian, Babylonian and other documents outside the Bible confirms the *prima facie* evidence of the Biblical documents in general both as to text and meaning; and that this text and meaning cannot be corrected or changed simply in order to be brought into harmony with the opinions of men of our generation. To demand that we should verify every statement of any ancient document (or modern for that matter) before we can reasonably believe it, is demanding the impossible. The most that we can reasonably require is that the author of the document and the document itself shall stand the test of veracity wherever their statements can be examined in the light of other testimony of the same age and provenance and of equal veracity. Examined in this way, I contend that our text of the Old Testament is presumptively correct, that its meaning is on the whole clear and trustworthy, and that we can as theists and Christians conscientiously and reasonably believe that the Old Testament as we have it is what it purports to be and what Christ and the apostles thought it to be, and what all churches have always declared it to be—the Word of God and the infallible rule of faith and practice.

In the title I use the phrase "Scientific Investigation," because I am trying to judge the Old Testament documents in the light of the facts made known in the documents of the nations who surrounded and influenced the people of Israel through all its history from Abraham to Ezra. Again, I have ventured to

use the term *scientific,* not merely because these conclusions are based on knowledge, but because, after the introductory pages, I have presented the evidence in an orderly manner, treating of text, grammar, vocabulary, and history in what I consider to be a logical sequence. The results of some of my investigations, such as those of the foreign words in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, and of the religion of Israel, have not yet been fully published. If it please the Lord to spare my life and grant me health I hope in the future to publish the results of my labors on these and other subjects.

It may help the less learned of my readers if I explain why I have given so much space to the discussion of text, grammar, and vocabulary.

As to the text, or written form, of the documents of the Old Testament, as they issued from their authors, it is obvious that, if we do not have exact copies of the original writings, it will be impossible for us to be sure that we have the very words of the prophets who wrote or approved these writings. In my discussion of the text, therefore, it is my endeavor to show from the evidence of manuscripts, versions, and the inscriptions, that we are scientifically certain that we have substantially the same text that was in the possession of Christ and the apostles and, so far as anybody knows, the same as that written by the original composers of the Old Testament documents.

As to grammar, since the critics date the documents of the Old Testament largely by the forms and syntactical constructions of the language, it is necessary to show that these forms and constructions are irrelevant as evidence of the time at which a document was written.

As to vocabulary, since all the commentaries and introductions to the Old Testament in general, or to particular books or documents of the Old Testament, are full of conclusions based upon the origin, or meaning of the Hebrew words, both as to the time, place, authorship and meaning of these books and documents, it is necessary to investigate the history of the Hebrew language and of the particular words produced in evidence, in order to see whether these words really prove what they are alleged to prove, with regard to the origin and contents of the books and documents.

Perhaps at this point it will be well also to give a statement of the conservative and radical views as to the time of the composition of the books of the Old Testament.

The radicals claim, in general, that the Canon was not completed till about 100 B. C., and in particular:

1. That the first six books, that is, the Pentateuch and Joshua, were composed by at least a dozen redactors out of five or more other books (J, E, D, H, and P), which were written from 900 to 450 B. C.; although, with the exception of Ezra, the authors and

redactors of these five books are alike unknown to history, either as to name, time or provenance. The sources of their information are also unknown to history, and consequently no one can rely upon the veracity of any statement in the Hexateuch. The books of Moses are simply a mythical and confused account of the origin of the people and institutions of Israel.

2. That the book of Judges is "hardly strictly history," but "probably traditions preserved among the individual tribes"; and that it was put in its present form "by a hand dependent on P," i. e., after 450 B. C. Most of the critics now admit that the larger part of the books of Samuel and Kings is from original sources written at the time of, or shortly after, the events recorded in them. Ruth and Esther are romances, idylls, or historical novels. Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah have some historical matter; the rest was invented for one purpose or another, mostly to exalt the priestly caste.

3. As to Hosea, Amos, Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Malachi, Ezekiel, and most of Jeremiah, the conclusions of the radical critics as to authorship and date are not very different from those of the conservatives. Jonah and Joel are placed after the captivity; Micah and Zechariah are divided into three parts and scattered over three or more centuries. Isaiah has a dozen or more authors, scattered over four centuries. In all the books anything looking like a prediction is ruthlessly cut out and attributed to

some unknown redactor of an age at, or after, the event. Daniel, because of its apocalypses, is placed about the middle of the second century B. C.

4. As to the other books, the radical critics are united in declaring that the Lamentations was not written by Jeremiah, nor the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs by Solomon. Some parts of Proverbs and all of Ecclesiastes are by many assigned to Persian or Greek times. As to the Psalms, most of the critics now deny that David wrote any of them, and many critics put the Psalms after the captivity and assign many of them to Maccabean times. Job is generally assigned to the sixth century B. C.

On the other hand, the conservative position is, in general, that the Canon of the books of the Old Testament was completed in the fifth century B. C., before the succession of the prophets ceased. As to the particular portions of the Old Testament, their view is:

1. That the Pentateuch as it stands is historical and from the time of Moses; and that Moses was its real author, though it may have been revised and edited by later redactors, the additions being just as much inspired and as true as the rest.

2. That Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings were composed from original and trustworthy sources; though, in the case at least of Kings, they were not completed till about 575 B. C.

3. That the prophets Hosea, Joel, Amos, Jonah, Micah, and Isaiah were all written about or before

700 B. C.; Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah before 600 B. C.; Jeremiah, Lamentations, and Ezekiel, between 650 and 550 B. C.; Daniel, Haggai and Zechariah between 550 and 500 B. C.; and Malachi in the fifth century B. C.

4. That there is good and sufficient reason for concluding that the headings of the Psalms are as a whole correct; that it is probable that all of the Psalms were written before 400 B. C.; that Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs and most of the book of Proverbs may, for all we know, have been written by Solomon; that Esther, Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles were written before 400 B. C.; and Job at 550 B. C., or earlier.

In conclusion, let me reiterate my conviction that no one knows enough to show that the true text of the Old Testament in its true interpretation is not true. The evidence in our possession has convinced me that at "sundry times and in divers manners God spake unto our fathers through the prophets," that the Old Testament in Hebrew "being immediately inspired by God" has "by his singular care and providence been kept pure in all ages"; and that, when the wisdom of men and the law of God had alike failed to save humanity, in the fullness of time, when all the preparation was complete, God sent forth His Son to confound

the wisdom of man and to redeem those who come under the Law. Thank God for the Holy Oracles. Thank Him yet more for "the unspeakable gift" of His love, who brought life and immortality to light in His gospel.

These studies originally appeared in The Princeton Theological Review for 1919, and after thorough revision, with the addition of much new material, are now published in this permanent form.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Method of the Investigation ..	19
II.	The Evidence: Text	65
III.	The Evidence: Grammar	105
IV.	The Evidence: Vocabulary	125
V.	The Evidence: History	167
VI.	The Evidence: Religion	207
VII.	Conclusion	213
	Glossary and List of Abbreviations .	217

I

THE METHOD OF THE INVESTIGATION

I

THE METHOD OF THE INVESTIGATION

IN THE common law of England, which is followed in most of our American commonwealths, the presumption is that the accused is innocent of an alleged crime until he shall have been proven guilty. It may be called the evidential system of jurisprudence. In contradistinction to this is the inquisitorial system in which the accused is supposed to be guilty unless he can establish his innocence. These two systems have their followers when we leave the forum of legal combat and enter that of Biblical literature and history. Those who pursue the inquisitorial method accuse the authors of the Old Testament books of anachronisms, inconsistencies, frauds, forgeries, and false statements, and boldly defy anyone to disprove their accusations. The would-be defenders of the authors are very much in the position of a man who would have defended a friend in the clutches of the Spanish inquisition.[1] He could not gain access to the accused and the accused had no means of communicating with him, except through the inquisitors themselves. So, Moses and Isaiah and Jonah are unable to communicate with us who would defend them;

[1] See Emil Reich: *The Failure of the Higher Criticism of the Bible.*

and those who accuse them, or their works, of misstatements and falsehoods wrest their words, stigmatize their motives, assume that their own opinions are testimony, and declare a verdict of guilty. They denounce as unscientific any attempt on the part of the defenders to establish the truthfulness and harmoniousness of the documents. They set themselves up as accusers, witnesses, jury and judges, and call unscholarly and traditional (word of scorn!) all who refuse to accept their verdict. They cry aloud: To the auto da fé with the book and with all the defenders thereof!

Examples of Critical Methods

genesis xiv

One of the most outstanding examples of the inquisitorial method of criticism is Gen. xiv, where we have the account of the expedition of Chedorlaomer against the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah. Of this expedition and of the defeat of it by Abraham, Wellhausen says, that they "are simply impossibilities." When it is shown that the kings of Babylonia had made similar expeditions as far as the Mediterranean in the time of Lugal-zaggizi and Sargon the First (cir. 3000 B. C.),[2] and in the time of Hammurabi (2000 B. C.),[3] and that in the time of Hammurabi, there

[2] King, *A History of Sumer and Akkad*, 197, 360.

[3] Jeremias: *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East*, I. 317, 322.

were kings with the names of Arioch, Tidal, and with at least the first part of the name Chedorlaomer,[4] that a man with the name of Abram is mentioned as early as 1950 B. C.,[5] the critics reply that some unknown Jewish archæologist of some time between 900 and 300 B. C., who happened to be in Babylon, concocted this little story in glorification of Abraham and succeeded in inducing Ezra and Nehemiah, or some later Jewish authorities before 280 B. C. (when the Septuagint translation was made),[6] to accept the fabrication as fact and to embody it among the archives of the Jewish people, by whom it has ever since been considered to be authoritative history.

In favor of the historical character of this narrative we have the evidence that it suits the time and the place, that the names of some of the principal actors are known to be names of persons living in the time of Hammurabi, that the names of the three kings confederated with Chedorlaomer have been identified as kings of the time of Hammurabi, that Elam had at that time and never afterwards the hegemony of Western Asia, that expeditions of the

---

[4] E. g. Kudur-Mabug, and Kudur-Nahundu. See King: *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi,* I. LV.

[5] See able discussions of Gen. xiv in Clay: *Light on the Old Testament from Babel,* 125-143, and Pinches: *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia,* p. 148.

[6] Or, probably, before 400 B. C., the latest date at which the Samaritans could have acquired their copy of the Pentateuch.

kind were common from 4000 B. C. to the time of the Persians and that oriental armies have again and again been put to flight by a sudden attack of inferior forces.[7]

Against the historical character of this narrative we have the assertion of Wellhausen and other critics of our times (only about 4,000 years after the supposed expedition!) that the expedition was *"simply impossible,"* and that it is probable that the account may have been fabricated (or forged) by some person unknown, at some time unknown, in some way unknown, and accepted as true history by some persons unknown, at some time unknown, for reasons unknown. Not one item of evidence in the way of time, place, logic, psychology, language, or customs, has been produced against the truthworthiness of the document. The *prima facie* evidence is supported by the circumstantial evidence. But a German professor says it is "simply impossible"; English followers echo "simply impossible," and the Americans echo again "simply impossible." And this assertion of simply impossible is called an "assured result of scientific criticism"![8]

---

[7] See Reich: *Loc cit.,* p. 81, Sayce PSBA, 1918, and Pilter PSBA, XXXV. 205-216.

[8] The evidence on Gen. xiv will be found in Hommel: *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition,* pp. 146-200; Albert T. Clay: *Light on the Old Testament from Babel,* pp. 125-143; Alfred Jeremias: *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East,* pp. 314-324; Pinches: *The Old Testament, etc.;* King: *The Letters and*

THE LAW OF HOLINESS

In contradistinction to the inquisitorial method is that which presumes a man to be innocent until he is proven guilty. As applied to documents it proceeds on the presumption that a document is to be presumed to be what it purports to be until it shall be proven that it is not. Thus the presumption is that the so-called Law of Holiness (Lev. xvii-xxvi) was the work of Moses, because seventeen times in these chapters it is said that Jehovah spake unto Moses saying what is in the following section, and because the Law begins with the statement "Jehovah spake unto Moses saying: Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons and unto all the children of Israel, and say unto them: This is the thing which Jehovah hath commanded," and ends with the subscription (xxvi. 46): "These are the statutes and ordinances and laws, which Jehovah made between him and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai by Moses." The superscription and the subscription mention the place, subject-matter, original speaker, mediators, and persons addressed. The contents of the chapters seem to substantiate the claim of the superscription and subscription.

The issue, then, is clearly drawn. Anyone who

Inscriptions of Hammurabi, I. pp. 49 ff., III. 68 ff., 6-11, 237; Schorr: *Urkunden des Alt-babylonischen Zivil-und-Prozesrechts,* pp. 589, 591, 595, 612; Pilter: *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology,* for 1913 and 1914; and many discussions by Professor Sayce.

successfully assails the veracity of this document must prove either that there is no Jehovah, or that He cannot address or speak to man, or that there was no Moses or Aaron, or that Jehovah did not speak to Moses, or that there were no children of Israel at that time, or that the laws were not given at Sinai. Its veracity cannot be directly assailed by an attack on its language for the document does not say that it was originally written in Hebrew. Nor would it prove its non-existence to show that it was not mentioned,[9] nor observed for four hundred or a thousand years after it was written; nor even to show that before the time of Ezra its injunctions were broken and the very opposite of them obeyed. Nor would it show that the document as a whole was not from Moses, if it could be demonstrated that certain parts of it were not from him, the critics themselves being witnesses; for they all claim that there are interpolations in Amos and Jeremiah while upholding their genuineness as a whole.[10] Nor would it show that the Law of Holiness was not given by Moses, if it could be proven that he did not write it with his own hand.[11] Nor would it prove that Moses was not

[9] The code of Hammurabi is not mentioned in any known document, except in the code itself. Outside of the *Zadokite Fragments,* there is no evidence for the existence of the Zadokite sect, nor for the practice of their laws.

[10] Compare the last section of the Gospel of Mark.

[11] The critics reiterate the statement that it is not said in the Pentateuch that *Moses* wrote any of it except the curse on

the author of the Law of Holiness to affirm that the same kind of argument which has been used with regard to it would prove also that Moses was the author of the Law of the Covenant in Ex. xx-xxiv, and of Deuteronomy and of the other documents of the Pentateuch, and that *they* could not have had the

---

Amalek, the Ten Commandments and certain other portions, as if this were an unanswerable argument against the Mosaic authorship of the Law. Is one to allege, then, that Hammurabi cannot be called the author of the code named after him, unless, forsooth, he inscribed it with his own hand? And yet the monument expressly ascribes itself to Hammurabi in the words of the epilogue (Col. xli. 59-67): "In the days that are yet to come, for all future times, may the king who is in the land observe the words of righteousness which I have written upon my monument." Or, is Sennacherib not to be called the author of Cylinder No. 103,000, unless he himself inscribed it? Yet it begins with his name and titles and is full of his words and deeds recorded in the first person, singular number. "I fashioned a memorial tablet," "I set it up," "I flayed Kirua," "I sent my troops." It is all I, I, I, my, my, my, from beginning to end; and yet, it is certain that he never wrote a word of it with his own hand. Or, is Darius Hystaspis not the author of the Behistun Inscription, whose sentences are largely in the third person and of which nearly every section begins with "Thus saith Darius the king"? What a subject for the painter's brush! Darius, the Persian Achæmenid, king of Babylon and of the lands, king of Upper and Lower Egypt, sitting on a scaffolding, his chisel in his left hand and his mallet in his right, cutting into the imperishable rock the record of his achievements by the grace of Ahuramazda! And how about Thothmes I and III, and Rameses II, III and XIII, and Shishak, and Tiglath-Pileser I and III, and Nebuchadnezzar I and II, and others, whose numerous and lengthy records have been preserved? Are we to suppose that Moses cannot have recorded his thoughts and words and deeds just in the same way that his predecessors, contemporaries, and successors, did?

same author. For if Jehovah was really the source of all the laws as the documents state, then any apparent inconsistencies between the codes must be possible to harmonize or must be due to errors of transmission, or, at least, will be no more against the consistency of the laws, if they were all written during Moses' lifetime than if they were uttered at widely separated periods of time. And if they were all the production of Moses, and he merely attributed them to Jehovah, this would simply remove the onus of the alleged inconsistencies from the shoulders of Ezra and the later Jews and place it upon the back of Moses. Why must we suppose that Moses would have avoided all inconsistencies, but that Ezra and all the numerous unknown but cunning redactors who are alleged to have composed the Pentateuch should have retained or inserted them? It is passing strange, also, that the Pharisees and Rabbis who tried to observe fully all the laws of the Pentateuch and actually thought they were doing so, should have failed to find in them those inconsistencies which to the modern critic seem so numerous and incomprehensible and irreconcilable.

Nor is there anything in The Law of Holiness that may not have been written 1,500 years before Christ as well as 500 years before. Indeed, we can scarcely conceive of a human society so ignorant as not to have understood all of its injunctions. No lawyer is needed to explain its simple, clear, and concise lan-

guage; and it is concerned with every day matters, such as the shedding of blood, the relation of the sexes, and duties to parents, strangers, and God.[12]

Nor can it be shown that there are any geographical or archæological references in the Law of Holiness that are unsuitable to the age of Moses. Nor can it be shown that the ideas of Holiness are such as could not have been known to Moses, or that they are so different from the ideas of JE, D and P as that they could not all have proceeded from the fertile brain of one man and age.[13] Where the ideas of

[12] The following is an analysis of the Law of Holiness: xvi, the day of atonement; xvii, laws concerning blood; xviii, laws of incest and lust; xix, xx, laws of holy living such as fearing parents (xix. 3), rejecting idols (vs. 4), offering acceptable peace offerings (5-8), helping the poor (9, 10), forbidding stealing and lying and profanity (11, 12), defrauding the workingman (13), injuring the deformed (14), perverting judgment (15), being a talebearer or hater of neighbors (16, 17), vengeance (18), mingling of cattle, seed or textiles (19), fornication (20-22), eating of holy fruit (23-25), or blood (26), practising magic (26), or mutilation (27, 28), or prostitution (29), profaning the Sabbath or the sanctuary (30), defiling themselves with familiar spirits, etc. (31), dishonoring the aged and stranger (32), and falsifying the weights and measures (35, 36), giving seed to Moloch (xx. 1-5), wizards (6), cursing parents (9), adultery (10-21); xxi and xxii, laws concerning holiness of priests; xxiii, the feasts; xxiv, xxv, various laws such as that concerning the oil and the lamp (1-4), the shew-bread (5-9), blasphemy (10-16), and the *lex talionis* (17-22); xxvi, epilogue.

[13] The reader will understand that the critics divide the first six books of the Bible (called the Hexateuch) into five principal documents; the Deuteronomyst document is denoted by D; the one using Jehovah as the name of God, by J; the one using Elohim by E; the priestly document by P; and the Law of Holiness by H. JE is employed for the portions where J and E are inextricably intertwined.

the different documents are the same and are expressed in the same language, they may of course have been by the same author. Where the ideas differ in phraseology but are substantially the same, this is also no indication of different authorship.[14] Where the subjects are the same and the ideas expressed differ, the author may have changed his mind, or he may have had different circumstances and conditions in view. Mohammed changed his views on marriage and other subjects and he changed the laws to suit his changing views. The condition of the Muslim changed after he went to Medina and especially after he set out to conquer the world; so, he began to make new laws for his anticipated empire.

Nor, finally, is the language such as would indicate a time inconsistent with that of Moses. To be sure, there are in this particular document words and phrases which occur seldom, or never, elsewhere. But this is no proof of age or authorship but simply of subject, aim, and method. Nowhere else in the Old Testament is this subject of holiness treated of fully. The aim of the writer is to secure the holiness of the people and he bases this holiness upon the holiness of God. Hence the frequent use of the phrases: "I Jehovah am holy," "I am Jehovah," and "I am Jehovah which sanctify you." Since this holiness was to

[14] Thus in the Koran, Mohammed refers five different times to the means by which Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed. In two cases only is the language the same.

be secured by obeying Jehovah's law, we have the frequent injunction to walk in, or to observe and do, the statutes and judgments of Jehovah; and the threats of God's setting his face against them and of their even bearing their own sins and being excommunicated if they profaned his name, sanctuary, or sabbaths. As to words occurring in this passage alone, or infrequently elsewhere, this is characteristic of every document and almost of every chapter of the Old Testament.[15] As to the claim that certain technical expressions[16] indicate a different author or age from that of the other documents of the Pentateuch, it is an assertion entirely unsupported by direct evidence and contrary to analogy.[17] That in the Law of Holiness the word for man should be repeated in the protasis in the sense of "whoever" [18] and that this phrase should occur eleven times in H and three times in P but not at all in JE or D is to be accounted for partly by the fact that JE and D are mostly in the second person and H and P in the third. Further, it is not clear that the idea of "whoever" as expressed by the repetition of the word for man is

[15] See page 134 f.

[16] Such as שאר, זמה and עמית (LOT, 49).

[17] Thus the omen texts (or laws) published by Dennefeld *(Babylonisch-Assyrische Geburts-Omina,* Leipzig, 1914), have eleven words not found elsewhere to denote parts of the human body and about twenty other new words, or new meanings of words.

[18] איש איש.

exactly the same as that expressed by other words and combinations. And lastly analogy shows that such variations are no necessary indication of different author or date.[19]

We have thus shown that in the peculiarities of H there is nothing opposed to its Mosaic authorship. But how about its authorship by another than Moses? Is it likely that a forger of a document would, scores of times, use phrases that occurred seldom, if ever, in the documents recognized as having been written by the author whose works he was imitating? Would not the perpetrator of a pseudepigraph, intended to be accredited as a genuine work of the author whose name was falsely attached to it, have had the prudence or common sense to avoid as far as possible all indications of recognizable variations from the acknowledged originals of the man whose name he had attached? To attempt to prove a forgery by showing the alleged writer never existed, or that the dates of

---

[19] Thus in Dennefeld's *Geburts-Omina* there are five different ways of expressing the idea of "the one" and "the other." See his introduction, pages 22, 23. The above remarks are based on the peculiarities of H as given in Dr. Driver's *Literature of the Old Testament,* pp. 49, 50. The same arguments which LOT uses to disprove the unity of the Pentateuch would disprove the unity of the Koran. We have in Mohammed's great work the same variety in the use of the names for God, duplicates, synonyms, contradictions, *hapax legomena,* and peculiar or favorite expressions. And yet all admit the unity of authorship of the Koran! See my article in PTR for 1919 on *The Use of "God" and "Lord" in the Koran.*

events, and peculiarities of language are wrong, is fair and according to the law of evidence;[20] but to expect us to believe that the forger of a document which was designed to be accepted as genuine should have made its language *differ* repeatedly, obtrusively and unnecessarily from that of another document by the author whom he is trying to imitate or personate, is contrary to common sense as well as to common law.

LAWS IN THE PENTATEUCH

ASCRIPTIONS

With regard to the remaining portions of the Pentateuch there is a stronge presumption that they are the work of Moses; for we find that the collections of laws, however great or small these collections may be and whatever their subject-matter, are in the E document attributed invariably to Moses. The so-called Code of the Covenant in Ex. xix-xxiv says in the prologue that Moses went up unto God in Mount Sinai and that the Lord said unto him: "These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the Children of Israel" (xix. 2-6). So "Moses went down unto the people and spake unto them" (xix. 25) the words of chapter xx and the judgments of xxi-xxiii. Then in chapter xxiv we are told that Moses told the people

[20] Compare Bentley's great argument against the genuineness of the Epistles of Phalaris in his *Dissertations Upon the Epistles of Phalaris.*

all the words of the Lord and all the judgments (vs. 3) and Moses wrote all the words of the Lord (vs. 4) and afterwards read the book of the covenant in the audience of the people; and they said, "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient" (vs. 7).

In like manner the book of Deuteronomy is again and again ascribed to Moses. Thus it begins: These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel on the banks of Jordan in the wilderness of the Arabah in the land of Moab (vs. 1-5). Again, in the epilogue in xxix. 1, it is said: These are the words of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, besides (i. e., apart from, or in addition to) the covenants which he made with them in Horeb.[21]

In P also the larger portions and the individual laws claim Moses as their author. Thus, the offering for the tabernacle and its plan were commanded by God to the people through Moses (Ex. xxv. 1, 9 f., xxix. 42, 43). So also with the laws of offering, Lev. i. 1, 2, vii. 37, 38; of the consecration of the priests, Lev. viii. 1, 5, 25, 36; of unclean food, Lev. xi. 1, 46, 47;

[21] In Deut. iv. 1, we read: "Hear O Israel," where Moses is represented as the speaker. In v. 1, Moses "called all Israel and said unto them." In xxvii. 1, 11, Moses "commanded the people." In xxxi. 1, Moses "went and spake to the people." In xxxi. 24, it is said that "Moses made an end of writing the words of the law upon a book." Compare also, xxxii. 44, 45, and xxxiii. 1.

of leprosy, Lev. xiii. 1, xiv. 54-57; and, in short, of all the other laws of the Pentateuch.

Now, with regard to any one in particular of these codes and laws, we do not see how any living man can have the assurance, the assumption of an impossible knowledge, to assert that it may not have been, as it claims to be, the work of Moses. Language, subject-matter, and circumstances, all favor the claim of each particular section to have been what it professes to be. It is only by resorting to what we deem an unjustifiable method of procedure that any case can be made out on behalf of the deniers of Mosaic authorship. This method in based on the *presumption* that the documents are forgeries and that the writers were guilty of false statements as to the time and place and authors of the documents. Being utterly unable to substantiate these charges by direct evidence bearing on the separate documents, these deniers of Mosaic authorship resort to two expedients. They charge, first, that some of the documents contain numerous unnecessary repetitions, and that these repetitions are often incongruous; secondly, that these incongruities result from the fact that the documents represent widely different periods of development in the history of Israel.

REPETITIONS

Taking up these charges in order, it is admitted that there are numerous repetitions of laws bearing

on the same subject, but it is denied that the repetitions prove that Moses was not the author. Every great teacher repeats. Every great reformer repeats. Witness Paul on the resurrection and on salvation by faith. Witness Mohammed on the unity of God and the condemnation of unbelievers.[22] The duality, or multiplicity, of authors cannot, then, be proven by the mere fact of repetitions.[23] Nor can it be argued from the fact that we cannot see the sense, or the reason, for the repetitions. Nor can it be argued from the fact that the repetitions are exactly alike, nor from the fact that they differ. Nor can diversity of authorship be argued from the fact that similar events are recorded as having occurred in the life of the same or different persons.[24]

To be sure, the critics make much of their inability to account satisfactorily to themselves for many of the differences and even adduce their ignorance of the reasons for them as if it were evidence against Mosaic authorship. And yet, good and sufficient reasons for most persons are evident in some of the repetitions. For example, take the laws with regard to the altar.

---

[22] Every sura of the Koran begins with the words: "in the name of the merciful and gracious God"; out of 114 suras 77 condemn the unbelievers by name and most of the others by implication.

[23] In the Koran, there are scores of parallels.

[24] All history and romance are full of such repetitions. Herodotus records several similar attacks on Athens by the Pisistratidae and two or more expeditions of the Persians against Greece. Cæsar twice says that he built a bridge over the Rhine and that

Might not Moses (or at least Jehovah) have foreseen that it would be several hundred years before the worship at the central sanctuary could be established and that even afterward the union of the tribes might be disrupted, so that men like Elijah might not be able to go to the central altar to sacrifice even when they would? Could a God, or a law-giver, who provided for a second passover for those who could not attend the first, and permitted a pair of turtle doves, or even a handful of flour (a bloodless offering) to be given by those who were too poor to present a kid, not be expected to authorize an altar for special cases and circumstances?[25]

INCONGRUITIES

The second charge is that there are in the Pentateuch at least five principal documents representing different periods of time and different points of view; and that these differences of aim and time account for the alleged incongruities of the works attributed to Moses and exclude the possibility of Mosaic authorship. This charge is based upon the assumptions: (a) that Deuteronomy (D) was written in, or shortly before, 621 B. C.; (b) that the real, or alleged, incongruities between the parts of the Pentateuch can be explained only by assuming a wide difference of date

---

he sailed twice against Britain. Don Quixote and Don Cæsar are full of repetitions. Everyone's life is full of them. So was that of Abraham; so was that of Moses.

[25] Cf. 1 K. iii. 2, 3.

in the time of their composition and a series of forgeries on the part of their authors.

(a) date of deuteronomy

For the assumption that Deuteronomy was written in, or shortly before, 621 B. C. there is absolutely no direct evidence. The testimony of Deuteronomy itself is that it was given by Moses in the plains of Moab. The passage in 2 Kings xxii-xxiii ascribes it to Moses (xxiii. 25). Josiah attributes the wrath of Jehovah to the fact that the fathers had not hearkened to the words of the book that had just been found and read before him (xxii. 8-13). Huldah, the prophetess, represents Jehovah as saying, I will bring upon this place all the words of the book which the king of Judah hath read (xxii. 16). The elders of Judah and of Jerusalem, and the king, and all the men of Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the priests, and the prophets, and all the people, both small and great heard the words of the book of the covenant which was found in the house of the Lord and covenanted to perform the words of the covenant that were written in this book (xxiii. 1-3). Although the book of Deuteronomy contains laws affecting the king (xvii. 14 f.) and the prophets (xviii. 15 f.) and the priests (xviii. 1 f.), and although it must be admitted that kings and prophets and priests had existed in unbroken succession from the time of Samuel down to the time of Josiah, and that the

kings and prophets and priests must have had the customary laws and regulations, yet no protest against the genuineness and authenticity of the newly-discovered book was made by king, or prophet, or priest. All accepted it as authoritative, and proceeded to carry its injunctions into execution (xxiii. 1-25).

Against this evidence of the documents themselves, the critics make the charge that the writers of the sources of 2 Kings xxii-xxiii (that is "the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah," cf. xxiii. 28), the composers of the books of Kings and Chronicles, and Hilkiah the high priest, Shaphan the scribe, Huldah the prophetess, and Jeremiah the prophet, were either forgers or dupes; and that Deuteronomy was not a work of Moses at all, but a composite work of an unknown author put together or at least promulgated for the purpose of deceiving the people into the acceptance of a great reform in worship. The kernel of this reform is affirmed to be the confining of the worship to the central sanctuary at Jerusalem. To be sure the book of Deuteronomy says nothing expressly about Jerusalem. Huldah, also, does not mention it as a central sanctuary (2 Kings xxii. 15-20). The king and people, including prophets, priests, and scribes, do not specifically mention a central sanctuary in their covenant with Jehovah (xxiii. 3). Jerusalem itself is mentioned, it is true, in xxiii. 23, as the place where the passover was held; but according to the books of Kings, the temple at Jerusalem

was to be the dwelling place of Jehovah (1 Kings viii. 29, ix. 3), in accordance with the promise made by God through Nathan to David (2 Sam. vii. 13). Jeremiah, who prophesied in the days of Josiah, speaks not merely of the fact that Jehovah had chosen Jerusalem to put His name there (vii. 11, 14, xxxii. 34), but also says that at the first Shiloh had been the place where the Lord had set His name (xix. 12). Not merely in the Pentateuch, but also thirty times in Joshua, once in Judges (xx. 17), sixty times in Samuel, and thirteen times in Kings, the ark is named as the center of the worship of the people of Israel. When this ark was removed to Jerusalem by David, and not till then, did the city become the place where men ought to worship (Jer. iii. 16, 17). Moreover, that Jerusalem was recognized as the place of the central sanctuary in the time of Solomon is clear from the fact that one of the first acts of Jeroboam, son of Nebat, was to appoint Bethel and Dan as rival centers, so as permanently to remove the people of Israel from the influence of the cult at Jerusalem (1 Kings xii. 28-33).

Thus neither for their general charge nor for their principal specification do the critics find any direct evidence in Deuteronomy or Kings nor in any other Old Testament document. Jeremiah, whose genuineness they acknowledge, is silent as to the general charge, but absolutely clear in his evidence against the specification with regard to the time of the organiza-

tion of the central sanctuary. It is time for the body of intelligent Christian believers, who are deemed capable of sitting on juries in a court of common law, to assert themselves against these self-styled scholars who would wrest from them the right of private judgment. For in the settlement of this question no special scholarship is involved—no knowledge of Hebrew or philosophy. The English version affords all the facts. The evidence is clear. On the face of it, it is all against the critics. Only by throwing out the evidence of the very document on which they rely for the proof of their own theory and by placing a childish confidence in what remains, can they find any support for their destructive views.[26]

(b) The Four Codes of Law

The critics charge that the incongruities which they allege are to be found between the code of the covenant (E) and Deuteronomy (D), and the Law of Holiness (H), and the priestly codex (P), are due to the fact that E represents the law as it existed prior to 700 B. C., D a law written about 621 B. C., H a law written about 600 B. C., and P a law written mostly before the events recorded in Neh. viii-x. Since the direct evidence of the documents themselves

[26] For good discussions of the origin of Deuteronomy, see Möller: *Are the Critics Right?;* Finn: *The Unity of the Pentateuch;* McKim: *The Problem of the Pentateuch;* Orr: *The Problem of the Old Testament;* and Green: *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch.*

is against this fourfold date and ascribes all four documents to Moses, the critics have undertaken the difficult task of proving that these laws constitute a series of forgeries, extending over a period of about 500 years, committed by more than seventeen different persons, all reformers of the highest ethical standards and all devoted to the service of Jehovah, the God of truth. Besides *mirabile dictu,* the forgeries were all successful in that prophets, priests, Levites, kings, and people, were all alike induced to receive them as genuine and to adopt them as obligatory, as soon as they were made known to them. The Jews and the Samaritans, the Pharisees and the Sadducees, the Rabbis, Aristeas, Josephus, Philo, Christ and the Apostles, all accepted the combined work as of real Mosaic authorship. But no amount of camouflage could deceive the critical eyes of the German professors and their scholars (all of whom agree with them; hence the phrase, "All scholars are agreed"). To them the imperfections of the codes and their disagreements, yes, even the particular half century in which each law was promulgated, are as clear as the spots on the sun, if only you will look through their glasses, and are not blinded by prejudice occasioned by faith in Jehovah, or Christ, or by the rules of evidence. Now, whether those who believe in Jehovah and Christ are blinded by prejudice, or not, it seems obvious that they who profess to believe in both cannot be expected without stultification to

ignore the testimony of all the documents that Jehovah Himself was the real author of the laws, Moses being merely his mouthpiece, or prophet. This testimony cannot be set aside in the case of the laws without being set aside also in the case of the prophets. There is no more ground for calling it a form of speech in the one case than in the other. And if Jehovah did speak the laws and command the people to obey them, it must seem reasonable to suppose that He at least thought that they were harmonious. Christians, also, and professedly Christian professors need make no excuse for the prejudice that this testimony of the documents themselves is confirmed for them (however it may be with infidels) by the attestation of the New Testament writers and of the Lord Jesus Christ. But whether Christians or infidels, *we should all be bound strictly by a prejudice in favor of the rules of evidence.* Binding ourselves, then, to abide by the evidence, let us proceed to state the evidence for the defense in the case of the critics against Moses.

First, we find that in every one of the legal documents of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, the superscription as in Num. xv, xix, xxxv, and in the case of all the longer collections such as Ex. xx-xxiv, xxv-xxxi, Lev. i-vii, xvii-xxvi, and Deuteronomy, and many of the smaller collections such as Ex. xii. 1-28, xxxiv, Lev. viii, xiii, xvi, xxvii,

Num. i, ii, iv, vi. 1-21, viii. 1-4, 5-22, xxvii. 6-23, xxviii-xxix, xxx, the subscriptions also expressly attribute their authorship to Moses. In many cases the locality and the time in which these codes, or special laws, were given are specified. Thus, Ex. xii was given in Egypt in the first part of the first month (vs. 1, 3); Ex. xix-xxiv, at Sinai in the third month of the first year of the Exodus (Ex. xix. 1, 11); Num. i. 1, at Sinai in the first day of the second month of the second year after they came out of the land of Egypt; Deuteronomy, in the land of Moab, on the first day of the eleventh month of the fortieth year (i. 1, 3, 5). In other cases as in Lev. xvii-xxvi and Ex. xxv-xxxi, the place at least is expressly stated. Here, then, are twenty separate documents all ascribed to Moses in the proper place and manner with dates and places affixed.

Secondly, we find that the variations in the form, treatment and subject-matter of the laws support the claim that Moses was the author. Some of the laws, as Lev. xi-xiii, treat of but one subject; others as Ex. xxxiv treat of several subjects; and others as Lev. xvii-xxvi and Deuteronomy may be dignified with the name of code. Some of them as Lev. xvi are so constructed that scarcely a verse could be omitted without marring the effect of the whole, whereas, others are composed of many parts, each distinct in its purpose, but all necessary to the carrying

out of the laws of its remaining parts.[27] Moreover, the laws of the covenant of JE in Ex. xx-xxiv and the epitome in xxxiv. 1-26, and the codes of H and D are mostly a collection of short injunctions more or less disconnected and without specification as to how they are to be carried out, whereas the laws in P are generally entirely separated from other laws, are detailed in their regulations and embrace many matters not discussed, or barely mentioned in the codes of JE, D and H. To this difference in treatment and details corresponds also a difference in literary form. The laws of JE, D and H are codal in form and resemble the prototype set by the code of Hammurabi in that they have lengthy prologues or epilogues; D and H containing at the end, just like the Babylonian code, a large number of curses upon those who should disobey their injunctions. The laws of leprosy vary from the other laws in accordance with the subject of which they treat. As to the laws of P there is an analogy to the laws of leprosy in the birth-omens,[28] and we may infer from the frequent references of Nabunaid to the necessity of discovering the corner-stone of the temples originally built by Naram-Sin, Hammurabi, and others of his predeces-

[27] Again, the persons addressed differ. In the codes it is the whole people who are enjoined, whereas the laws of P affect ordinarily only certain classes of individuals, such as priests, lepers, and Nazarites.

[28] See the *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geburts-Omina*, by Ludwig Dennefeld, Leipzig, 1914.

sors, that these temens or corner-stones contained detailed plans for the construction of the houses of the gods, corresponding to the plan of the tabernacle in Ex. xxv-xxx.[29] The narrative in Ex. xxxvi-xl of the manner in which this plan was carried out under the direction of Bezaleel is paralleled, also, in many respects by the account in the autobiography of the Erpa Tehuti, the director of the artificers of the temples, and shrines of Hatshepsut, who according to most Egyptologists was queen of Egypt two centuries before the times of Moses.[30] The form of the numeration of Num. i-iv bears many resemblances to those of the Annals of Tahutmes III.[31] The boundaries of the land given in Num. xxxiv resemble closely similar forms in Babylon.[32] The form of the ceremonies of the day of atonement in Lev. xvi may be compared with the Ritual of the Divine Cult,[33] and the laws of issues, jealousy, and the red heifer (Lev.

---

[29] In King's *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi* II. pl. 242, No. 107, we have the plan of the temple of Sippar at Jahrusum made during the period of the first dynasty of Babylon.

[30] Budge: *The Literature of the Egyptians,* London, 1914, p. 145.

[31] Petrie: *History of Egypt,* II, 103 f.

[32] Hinke: *A New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadnezzar I,* and the tablet from the time of Hammurabi in KB, IV, 17. The Egyptians had boundaries for countries, nomes, and farms. See Breasted's *Ancient Records of Egypt,* V. 109, and Hinke's note in *A New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadnezzar I,* p. 9. See, also, King's *Babylonian Boundary Stones.*

[33] Budge: *op. cit.,* p. 248.

xv, Num. v, xix) with the Ritual of Embalmment.[34] That minute directions for the conduct of sacrifices, similar to those in Lev. i-vii, must have been in use among the Egyptians is evident from the Liturgy of Funerary Offerings found in the Pyramid Texts;[35] as also from the Liturgy of the Opening of the Mouth.[36] That detailed directions for the selection and clothing of priests like those in Leviticus must have existed among the Egyptians is to be seen in the Liturgy of the Opening of the Mouth,[37] and the form of the regulations of Leviticus has a parallel in the inscription of Agum-Kakrimi (1350 B. C.) which describes the dress of Merodach and Sarpanit (KB, III, I, 135 f.); and especially in the dedication cylinder of Nabonidus containing the account of the consecration of his daughter as a votary of Nannar.[38]

We thus see that the various forms in which the sections of the law are preserved to us in the Pentateuch are paralleled in almost every instance by the forms of laws to be found in known documents of ancient Babylon and Egypt dating from 1000 to 4000 (?) B. C. And what in general is true of the form is true also of the contents of the laws. The civil and criminal laws of E, D, and H, bear a striking

[34] *Id.* 247.
[35] Budge: *op. cit.* 16.
[36] *Id.* 13.
[37] *Id.* p. 14.
[38] See *Miscellaneous Inscriptions in the Yale Babylonian Collection,* by Albert T. Clay, Vol. I, pp. 66-75.

resemblance to those found in the Code of Hammurabi.[39] The moral precepts find their prototype and often their parallels in the maxims of Ptah-hotep (3000 B. C.), and in the moral precepts of the 125th chapter of the Book of the Dead.[40] As to the ceremonial laws it can be claimed that the elaborate, lengthy, and intricate, systems of worship centering around the numerous temples of the polytheistic Babylonians and Egyptians make the system of worship and religious observances enjoined in H and P seem in comparison models of clearness, simplicity, and ease in execution.

In the third place, the laws of Moses, as Emil Reich has so well argued,[41] demand a single great originator. Granting a great man like Moses, the prophetic mediator of God's ideas, and the fabric of the tabernacle, with the priesthood, and the sacrifices, and the sacred seasons, and the laws of holiness, and the covenants between the holy people and their unique God, rises before us as naturally as the constitution of the imperial Cæsars from the mind of Augustus, or the religion of Islam from the life of the Arabian prophet, or the Christian Church from the life and death and precepts of its Founder. It was the idea of God which Moses had that was the

[39] See especially Müller: *Die Gesetze Hammurabis* and Kohler: *Hammurabi's Gesetz.*

[40] 18th dynasty or earlier. Budge: *Egyptian Literature,* 52, 22.

[41] *The Failure of the Higher Criticism of the Bible.* See, also, Naville's *The Higher Criticism in Relation to the Pentateuch.*

spring of his activities, the source and unifier of his thoughts and laws. No one can deny that the idea of a unique God was first obtained from the Israelites nor that their literature always ascribes the first clear and full apprehension of this idea to Moses. How much of it he got from his meditations beneath the desert skies and how much by the direct revelation of the all-wise and all-powerful Jehovah, may be questioned; but that he had it, is the concurrent testimony of J and E and D and H and P and of all Jewish literature in legislation, history, and song. Prophets, priests, kings, poets, and people,—all had this great idea, and all unite in saying that they derived it from Moses. And whatever Israelites were the first to be possessed with the Old Testament idea of an only God, let us remember that some Israelite certainly must have been thus possessed, seeing that the idea is to be found in ancient literature in the Old Testament and there alone. What more natural, then, than that the great thinker who first grasped the idea in its fulness should have found a revolution wrought in the whole system of his thinking. The universe with all its rolling years, the sun, the moon, the stars, the earth with its seas and islands, its plants and living creatures, must all be correlated to the great I AM, who made them all. And a greater than he has said that the law was ordained by angels through the hand of a mediator.

But the most engrossing subject of his thought

must have been man in his relation to the earth and God and sin and death and redemption. And so he gathers up the history and the traditions of the past and centers the whole about the idea of a promise and the covenants, the covenant with Adam, the covenant with Noah, and the covenant with Abraham. And when God makes a covenant with the people of Israel through him as mediator he sets all his mind and energies to work to enable the people to observe their part of the covenant until the star should arise out of Jacob and he whose right it is, that prophet like unto himself, should come, whom Israel should hear, and to whom should be the obedience of the nations. And with this great thought in mind he sets himself to work to separate the Israelites from all the surrounding nations and from the polytheistic nations which had ruled them in the past. He takes the two great conceptions of natural religion, holiness and righteousness,[42] and seeks to separate them from their idolatrous associations and to raise them to a higher ethical and religious plane in the service of the one, ever-living, and true God.

As for a language and a literary form in which to express his thoughts, he did not have to invent them. They were already there.[43] All he had to do was to

[42] קדש and צדק.

[43] We have shown this already for the form. As to the existence of the Hebrew language before the time of Moses, it is abundantly shown in the proper names of the inscriptions of the times

infuse new meaning into the old vehicles of thought, as in later times the New Testament writers did with the vocables of Greece, and Mohammed with those of the Arabs.[44]

As for the festivals, there were already plenty of them in use among the Babylonians and Egyptians and doubtless among the Israelites themselves,—New Year, and New Moons, and Sabbaths. He simply had to take the old seasons and sanctify them to better purposes.[45] Sacrifices there also were and altars and priests. He brings them all into ordered harmony with his idea of holiness and righteousness in the service of Jehovah. Ethics there were. He gives them the sanction of the divine command, and approval. Customs there were, laws of clean and unclean food, laws of jealousy, and revenge and disease and personal uncleanness, and fringes on garments, and tattooing, and vows and inheritances, and slavery and marriage. He brings all into his all embracing scheme and makes them all subserve the one great purpose of bringing and keeping the people in obedience to their covenant God. Requirements and observances were multiplied until it was impossible

---

of Hammurabi, Tahutmes III and Amenophis IV, and in the 111 common terms of the Amarna Letters. See Knudtzon: *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, p. 1545 f, and W. Max Mueller: Die Palästinaliste Thutmosis III.

[44] E. g. in the case of *hanif*.

[45] It is not meant that some entirely new festivals may not have been added.

for the people not to sin; but for the sins there was atonement and for the sinners, substitution, redemption and forgiveness, of a God that was long-suffering and gracious, plenteous in mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, though he would by no means spare the guilty.[46]

Fourthly, against this *prima facie* case in favor of the Mosaic origin of the laws and against the life of Moses and the history of Israel as recorded in the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, the critics bring a general charge and a number of specifications. The general charge is that the Pentateuch was not the work of Moses, but that it, together with the book of Joshua, is a compilation of the works of seventeen, or more, authors and of laws and traditions of little historic value gathered together during a period of five or six hundred years from 800 or 900 B. C. to 300 B. C. Inasmuch as no claim is made in Genesis or Joshua that they are the works of Moses, we claim the privilege (without precluding or prejudicing the right of Moses to be considered the author of Genesis) of confining for the present discussion the defense of Mosaic authorship to the four last books of the Pentateuch. And, as the charge involves the question of the authorship, as well as the much more important question of the his-

[46] That is, those who refused the means of grace or wilfully disobeyed his commands, like the man who gathered sticks on the Sabbath day, or Korah, Dathan and Abiram.

toricity of the books we shall discuss first of all this fundamental question of authorship.

AUTHORSHIP. It must then, clearly be defined what exactly is meant by Mosaic *authorship*. Certainly, it cannot mean that to be the author Moses must have written his literary works with his own hand. Else, would Prescott not be the author of the Conquest of Mexico, nor Milton of Paradise Lost, nor the kings of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, and Persia, of their inscriptions, nor Jesus of the Sermon on the Mount. Lest this statement should seem too naive, let us recall that a favorite and reiterated traditional argument of the critics against Mosaic authorship is based on the fact that it is not expressly said that he was charged by God to write anything but the curse against Amalek and an account of the wanderings in the wilderness (Ex. xvii. 14, Num. xxxiii. 2). Besides these small portions of the narrative, he is said to have written the code of the covenant in Ex. xxxxiv, and a portion at least of Deuteronomy.[47] In fact it may reasonably be inferred from Deut. xxxi. 9, 24-26, iv. 44, 1, 5, xxviii. 58, 61, xxix. 20, 26, and other passages, that the whole Pentateuch, or at least all of the legal portions, was intended by the writers of these passages to have been designated as having been written by, or for, Moses.

But even if he did not write a word with his own

[47] See Dr. Green: *On the Pentateuch*, p. 37.

hand, it is evident that whoever wrote the book meant to imply that the authorship of Moses extends to the laws and visions and commands which God gave to him in the same manner that the Code of Hammurabi was the work of the king whose name it bears. That is, the laws came through him and from him. This is the fundamental authorship for which we contend, and which we claim to have been unimpeached by all the testimony that has been produced, in the endeavor to impair our belief that as John says: The law was given by Moses.

The case then, as it stands, is as follows. The documents of the Tetrateuch state that Moses at expressly stated places and times wrote, or caused to be written,[48] certain parts of them. The critics charge that these statements of the documents are all false. What proof have they to substantiate this charge?

MOSES WROTE

First, they allege that "Moses wrote" in these passages is not a forgery, but simply a technical expression, or form of speech. But what evidence have they for this allegation? None whatever; but on the contrary, the evidence of the profane literature and of the other books of the Old Testament is all against it.

As early as the fourth dynasty of Egypt, documents

[48] The verbs may be pointed as Hiphil.

are dated and the name of the authors given,[49] and in Babylon, as early as the dynasty of Hammurabi, documents are dated as to month, day, and year, and the names of the scribes and the principal persons engaged in the transactions recorded are given.[50]

In the Biblical documents also, it is the custom to give the author of the legislation. Thus in the book of Joshua, the earlier legislation is invariably attributed to Moses,[51] and the new regulations are ascribed to Joshua himself.[52] So in Samuel, the old laws are ascribed to Moses and the new ones to Samuel.[53] So in Kings, Solomon regulates his kingdom and Jeroboam the son of Nebat regulates the worship of Israel with laws that are never ascribed to Moses, but to the kings themselves, who are represented as departing in large measure from the law of God already known (1 Ki. viii-xi; xii. 25-33; xiv. 7-16). So in Chronicles David divides the priests and Levites and writes out the pattern of the temple. Jehoshaphat himself gives laws, and sets judges in the land, and gives them charge as to their duties (2 Chron. xix. 5-11), and proclaims a fast without reference to the laws of Moses; and Hezekiah sets the Levites according to the commandment of David (2 Chron.

[49] See Breasted's *Ancient Records of Egypt*, I, 891.
[50] See Schorr: *Urkunden des altbabylonischen Zivil- und Prozess-rechts.*
[51] i. 7, xx. 2, xxiii. 6.
[52] xxiv. 26.
[53] 1 Sam. viii. 6-22.

xxix. 25-27). In Nehemiah, the singers and the porters keep the word of their God according to the commandment of David and of Solomon his son (Neh. xii. 45).[54] Moreover, is it not marvelous that no example has been found in pre-Christian literature of the ascription to Moses of a law not found in the Pentateuch? You may be sure that if one such were known it would have been proclaimed by the traducers of the unity of the Pentateuch with a blare of trumpets, for it would be the unique specimen of direct evidence bearing on their alleged common use of the phrase to denote non-Mosaic authorship. But no. Tobit has his hero burn the fish's liver at the command of an angel, not according to a law of Moses. The Zadokite fragments never ascribe their additions to the Pentateuchal laws to Moses. Therefore, let those who allege that the phrase "the Lord said to Moses" is a legal fiction produce some evidence or let the indictment of the claim of the laws of the Pentateuch to Mosaic authorship be dropped. Some later writer by mistake or intention surely might have ascribed one law at least not found in the Pentateuch to Moses. But no such ascription has been found. No, not one.

Again, we find that no law of the four books from Exodus to Deuteronomy inclusive is in the Penta-

[54] Whenever Chronicles and Nehemiah were written, their testimony shows that the writer did not know anything about a legal fiction ascribing all laws to Moses.

teuch, or anywhere else in the pre-Christian Jewish literature, attributed to anyone but Moses. The modern critic asserts that the laws called Mosaic were not given by him but that they were written by at least seventeen different authors and redactors; and yet not one of these critics can mention the name of even one of these seventeen. To be sure, some of them have assumed that Hilkiah forged the portion of Deuteronomy which, according to the accounts in Kings and Chronicles (the only sources of our information on the subject) Hilkiah himself attributed to Moses. And we find that some have alleged that Ezekiel *may* have written the Code of Holiness in Lev. xvii-xxvi, but unfortunately for the critics, Ezekiel who is never backward about affixing his name to his other works, abstained from doing so to the work under consideration.

Again some have asserted that Ezra may have written P or even have composed the whole Pentateuch; but here again they draw on their imagination for their facts, since the books of Ezra and Nehemiah both state clearly that Zerubbabel and Ezra and Nehemiah established in Jerusalem the laws and institutions that had been given by God to Israel through Moses.[55]

---

[55] Thus, according to Ezra iii. 3, Jeshua and Zerubbabel built the altar, "as it is written in the law of Moses," and offered sacrifices and set the priests and the Levites in their offices "as it is written in the book of Moses" (vi. 18). According to Neh.

WHERE MOSES WROTE

In the next place, all the laws of the Pentateuch attributed to Moses are either expressly, or impliedly, said in the record to have been given at certain *places,* that is, either in Egypt, or somewhere on the way from Egypt to the Jordan. This evidence, as to the localities in which the documents were written, so important in establishing the genuineness of any document, is almost absolutely ignored by the assailants of Mosaic authorship. What kind of lawyer would he be who attacked or defended the genuineness of a letter without considering whether the locality where it was written was mentioned and whether paper, ink, language, and contents, harmonized with the alleged place of its production? Now it is said that the following sections of the law were commanded in the localities cited, to wit: Ex. xii in Egypt (Ex. xii. 1), Ex. xix-xxiv, xxv-xxxi, and xxxiv, at the mountain; Lev. i-vii, in the wilderness of Sinai; Ex. xix,

viii. 1, 3, Ezra the scribe brought and read the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel. And in vs. 14, we are told that they "found written in the law which the Lord had commanded by Moses" certain laws with regard to the feast of Tabernacles. In ix. 3, it is said that the book of the law of God was read and it is acknowledged in vs. 34 that the kings and princes and fathers had not kept the law. But the people covenanted (x. 29) to walk in God's law which was given by Moses the servant of God. Again, in xiii. 1, we are told that "they read in the book of Moses." On the other hand, the service of song is said to have been reinstituted after the ordinance of David, king of Israel (Ezra iii. 10).

1, 2, 3, 20, xxiv. 12, 13, 16, xxxi. 18, xxxiv. 2, 29, Lev. vii. 38, xxv. 1, xxvi. 46, xxvii. 34, Num. i. 1, iii. 1, ix. 1, out of the tabernacle of the congregation (Lev. i. 1). Others are preceded by the phrases: after they had left Egypt (Lev. xi. 45, xxii. 33, xxiii. 43, xxv. 55, Num. xxv. 41); from the camp (Lev. xxiv. 23, Num. v. 2; when ye come into the land (Num. xv. 2, 18, xxxiii. 51, xxxiv. 2, Deut. xxvi. 1, xxvii. 2); while they were in the wilderness (Num. xv. 32); in the plains of Moab (Num. xxvi. 3, 63, xxvii. 3 [by implication], xxxi. 1, xxxvi. 13, Deut. i. 5, xxix. 1).

Now, the critics adverse to Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch have been sharp enough to see that if they can throw doubt upon the accuracy of the documents with regard to these places, they will impugn the veracity of the accounts. So, after a hundred and fifty years of diligent search they find one apparent flaw. It seems that E and D use Horeb in place of the Sinai of J and P as the locality of the giving of the law. Horeb is said to be the designation of the mountain of God used in the northern part of Palestine where E is assumed to have been written and Sinai that used in Judah, where J and P were written. But the critics fail to attempt even to show why D, a document of the southern kingdom, should have followed E instead of J, and why P should have failed to harmonize this alleged discrepancy, or even to have remarked upon it. Perhaps, the simplest and

most obvious explanation is the best. Horeb and Sinai were in a sense the same, just as the Appalachian chain and the Alleghany Mountains and Chestnut Ridge are the same. I was born near the Chestnut Ridge of the Alleghany Mountains of the Appalachian chain. In Europe I might speak of the Appalachian Mountains as my birthplace; in California, of the Alleghanies; in Western Pennsylvania, of the Chestnut Ridge. But I was born in only one place. So, as Hengstenberg long ago said,[56] "at a distance the mountain of God was called Horeb; near at hand, it was called Sinai, or once possibly Horeb."[57] The use of mountain before Horeb is no proof that it was a single eminence and not a ridge; for Mount Ephraim was "the hill country of Ephraim" or as Hastings Dictionary says,[58] "the mountain ridge in Central Palestine stretching N. to S. from the Great Plain to the neighborhood of Jerusalem."

---

[56] *On the Genuineness of the Pentateuch,* II, 327.

[57] Ex. xxxiii. 6, in a passage of which Dr. Driver said: "No satisfactory analysis has been effected," LOT, 38. In his work entitled *From the Garden of Eden to the Crossing of the Jordan,* Sir William Wilcox claims that Horeb and Sinai were both in the northern part of the peninsula and that the law was given from both. Prof. Sayce, also, puts both of them in the northeastern part of the peninsula. If Sinai is a part of Horeb the whole argument of the critics falls.

[58] Vol. I, p. 727.

WHEN MOSES WROTE

But lastly, not merely are all of the documents of the Tetrateuch (with the exception of a few ascribed to Aaron) ascribed to Moses, and the place where most of them originated indicated, many of them are *dated* as to year, month, and day. The critics *quietly* ignore these dates. They would possibly attribute them to the cunning of the forger, and assert that they were inserted with the express purpose of giving to the documents in which they occur the appearance of verisimilitude. Think of a counsel arguing before a court that the fact that a document—a will, a contract, a letter, a cheque—was correctly dated was *prima facie* evidence, not that it was genuine, but that it was a forgery! Let the critics show at least that the dates are not in the form of dates used in the time of Moses. But this they cannot do. But, on the other hand, it can be shown that in every particular the dates are of the same form as those that were used before 1500 B. C. There are two full forms of dates in the Pentateuch. The first gives the order of day, month, year, as in Num. i. 1: "the first day of the second month of the second year after their going out from Egypt"; and the second, the order of year, month, day, as in Num. x. 11, "in the second year, in the second month, in the twentieth day of the month," and Deut. i. 3, "in the fortieth year in the eleventh month on the first day of the month,"

and Num. xxxiii. 38, "in the fortieth year of the going out of the children of Israel from the land of Egypt in the fifth month on the first day of the month." The distinguishing feature of these two systems of dating is that the former puts the year last and the latter the year first. The first system was used in Babylon and Nineveh from the earliest documents down to the latest, and the second system was used in Egypt in like manner from the earliest dynasties down to the time of the Ptolomies. Thus "in the month Ab, the 22d day, in the year after king Rim-Sin had conquered Isin";[59] "In the month Ayar, day 20, of the year after king Samsuiluna, etc.";[60] "in the month Shebat the 14th day, the second year after the destruction of Kiš."[61] [62] It will be noted that in every particular but one the dating of Num. i. 1 is like the datings from the time of Abraham. This particular is that Numbers puts the day before the month. This, however, was a usual departure of the Hebrew writers in using the Babylonian system. Jeremiah lii. 12 is the only place in the Old Testament where we find the order month, day, year. In Hag. i. 15, ii. 10, Zech. i. 7, and Ezra vi. 15, all from post-captivity times, we find the order day, month, year, as

[59] Schorr: *Urkunden des altbabylonischen Zivil- und Prozessrechts,* p. 53.

[60] *Id.* 153.

[61] *Id.* 214.

[62] These kings lived in or about the time of Hammurabi. See, also, Schorr, p. 279, 328, 416, for other examples.

in Num. i. 1. In all of these post-captivity writings the name of the king is given exactly as we find it on the Babylonian documents from the time of Nebuchadnezzar II; whereas in Num. i. 1, the dating is "after the going out of Egypt" just as in the earliest Babylonian documents.

Examples of the Egyptian system of dating are to be found in numerous places in Petrie's *History of Egypt,*[63] in Breasted's *Ancient Records,*[64] and in the *Oxyrynchus Papyri.*[65] It is worthy of note, also, that the phrase "after the going out from Egypt" is paralleled in many cases in the earliest Egyptian records.[66] The Egyptian system is the one used commonly in the Old Testament by the writers who wrote before the return from Babylonia, and occasionally by those who wrote after 550 B. C. Thus we find the order year, month, day in Jer. xxxix. 2; xii. 4, 31; Ezek. i. 1; viii. 1; xxiv. 1; xxix. 1, 11; xxx. 20; xxxi. 1; xxxii. 1; xxxiii. 21; and Hag. i. 1; and the order year, day, month in Ezek. xx. 1; xxvi. 1; xxxii. 17; xl. 1; Zech. vii. 1.

We see, therefore, from the above evidence that of the four full datings in the Pentateuch three follow the Egyptian system and one the old Babylonian. Of the three following the Egyptian system one is in the

[63] E. g. II, 67, 100-103.
[64] E. g. I, 137, 139, 140, 145, 160.
[65] E. g. I, 170, 178, etc.
[66] Breasted *loc. cit.* I, 54.

prologue to D[67] and two are in P.[68] The one in Num. i. 1 follows the Babylonian order and belongs also to P. But the clause affixed (i. e., after the going out from Egypt) resembles the dates from the Hammurabi dynasty and not those from the time of Nebuchadnezzar or later. So that in respect to dates, as well as in respect to names and places, we find that the genuineness of the documents of the Pentateuch cannot be successfully assailed.

CONCLUSION

In regard to no one of these great *prima facie* marks of genuineness in documents—names, places, dates—have the destructive critics been able to show that the statements of the Pentateuch are false. As to these three specifications of the indictment, the assured result of scientific criticism, in strict adherence to the law of evidence, is that Moses gave the laws which have his name at the times and places indicated in the documents attributed to him as the mouthpiece of Jehovah.

---

[67] i. 3.

[68] Num. xi. 11; xxxiii. 38; both assigned in LOT to P.

II

THE EVIDENCE

TEXT

II

THE EVIDENCE: TEXT

HAVING thus shown by three examples taken from the documents of the Pentateuch that from a *prima facie* point of view these documents are substantiated by the evidence from the forms of contemporary documents and by the evidence as to their author and as to the times, places, and contents of their composition, we shall proceed to consider the attacks of the critics upon the text, the grammar, vocabulary and contents of the documents of the Old Testament, on the basis of whose "assured results" they seek to establish their reconstruction of the literature and history of the people of Israel.

In the remainder of this chapter and in the immediately following pages, I shall confine myself to the *text,* and shall endeavor to show that in view of the evidence bearing upon its origin and transmission the Hebrew text of the Massoritic Bible now in our possession is substantially reliable. In this and the succeeding discussions, I shall seek to follow without prejudice the laws of evidence as laid down in Sir James Fitzjames Stephen's *Digest of the Law of Evidence* in so far as these laws relate to documents. Where the evidence is already published and accessible to all, I shall merely refer my readers to the

works containing the evidence. In cases where new evidence bearing on the subject can be produced I shall go more largely into particulars in order to show the grounds for my statements. As it will be impossible within the limits of a work such as this to give all the items of evidence, numerous citations of the sources of the testimony will be given; since it is the purpose of the writer to remove the discussion as far as possible from the field of subjective opinion to that of objective reality.

In the space at my disposal, it will be impossible to do more than suggest the reasons why I think that the charges against the general reliability of the Massoritic text cannot be supported by the documentary evidence, that is, by the "documents produced for the inspection of the Judges," [69] and by the opinion of experts which may be called evidence as to what the evidence of the documents really is.[70]

---

[69] See for this definition of "evidence," Sir James Fitzjames Stephen's work *A Digest of the Law of Evidence*, p. 3. He defines evidence as "documents produced for the inspection of the Court or Judge." In this case of the critics against Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, every intelligent reader may consider himself the Court and judge and jury.

[70] The fact that a person is of the opinion that a fact in issue, or relevant or deemed to be relevant to the issue, does or does not exist is deemed to be irrelevant to the existence of such fact, except when "there is a question as to any point of science or art." When such a question arises, "the opinions upon that point of persons especially skilled in any such matter are deemed to be relevant facts."

TESTIMONY OF EXPERTS NECESSARY

The testimony of experts as to what the evidence really is, is especially necessary as to all subjects requiring special study or experience, such as all matters of science and art.[71] "It is a general rule of evidence that witnesses must give evidence of *facts,* not of *opinions.*" [72] But "facts, not otherwise relevant, are deemed to be relevant if they support or are inconsistent with the opinions of experts, when such opinions are deemed to be relevant." "Whenever the opinion of any living person is deemed to be relevant, the grounds on which such opinion is based are also deemed to be relevant," and "an expert may give an account of experiments performed by him for the purpose of forming his opinions." [73]

In fact, in questions of philology and history it is

---

[71] Science and art "include all subjects on which a course of special study or experience is necessary to the formation of an opinion." Persons thus qualified are called "experts." "The opinion as to the existence of the facts on which his [i. e., the expert's] opinion is to be given is irrelevant unless he perceived them himself."

[72] Italics in Stephen. He says further: "An expert may not only testify to opinions, but may state general facts which are the result of scientific knowledge." "The unwritten or common law of other states or countries may be proved by expert testimony." Genuine writings "may be used for comparison by the jury" or "by experts to aid the jury." "Experts in handwriting may also testify to other matters, as e. g., whether a writing is forged or altered, when a writing was probably made, etc."

[73] See Stephen's *Digest,* 100-112. The words not in quotation marks and the italicizing are due to the present writer.

the experiments, i. e., the investigations of the original sources, which afford the grounds for the opinions of the expert, that are the most important part of his evidence; for they give the facts on which his conclusions are based. If the experiments or investigations have been faulty, either from an incomplete induction of the facts, or from a wrong interpretation of them, the grounds, or reasons, or opinions, based on the facts will also be faulty.

Importance of a correct text

In the case, therefore, of a literary document the first fact to investigate and establish is the original text of the document, and the second is the meaning of that text. When the original text can be produced the correct interpretation of it is the principal matter, unless charges of interpolation are made. If, however, the original document cannot be produced, certified copies of the original, or copies approximating as nearly as possible to the original, may be introduced as evidence, and will have value for all parties to a controversy in proportion as they are recognized as genuine copies of the original. It is this fact that makes the question of the transmission of the text of the Old Testament fundamental to all discussions based upon the evidence of that text. Only in so far as we can establish a true copy of the original text shall we have before us reliable evidence for our inspection and interpretation. In regard to the Old

Testament therefore, the first question to determine is whether we have a reliable copy of the original text. It is my purpose to convince my readers that the answer of experts to this question must be an unhesitating admission that in the text of our common Hebrew Bibles, corrected here and there, especially by the evidence of the ancient versions and through the evidence from palæography, we have presumptively the original text. That is, we have it with sufficient accuracy to be reliable as evidence on all great questions of doctrine, law, and history. In support of this opinion, we shall in accordance with Sec. 54 of Stephen's *Digest,* give the following grounds, with the statement of the investigations on which they are based.

I. Direct Evidence for Text

1. An examination of the Hebrew manuscripts now in existence shows that in the whole Old Testament there are scarcely any variants supported by more than one manuscript out of 200 to 400, in which each book is found, except in the use of the full and defective writing of the vowels.[74] This full, or defective, writing of the vowels has no effect either on the sound or the sense of the words. These manuscripts carry us back at least to the year 916 A. D., the date of what is probably the oldest MS. of any large part of the Hebrew Bible.

[74] See the collections of variants by Kennicott and DeRossi.

2. The Massorites have left to us the variants which they gathered and we find that they amount altogether to about 1,200, less than one for each page of the printed Hebrew Bible.[75]

3. The various Aramaic versions (or Targums), the Syriac Peshitto, the Samaritan version, and the Latin Vulgate support with slight variations the present text.[76]

4. The numerous citations in the New Testament,

---

[75] These variants are to be found on the bottom margin of the Hebrew printed Bible.

[76] See my comparisons of the Hebrew and Peshitto texts of Chronicles in *Hebraica,* Vol. XIV, 282-284. A comparison of the proper names of the Hebrew original and the Syriac version shows hundreds of variations of sight, largely between *r* and *d*, *n* and *y*, and *k* and *b;* hundreds more of variations due to sound, as *sh* and *s*, *'z* and *s*, *d* and *t*, *d* and *z*, *b* and *m*, *b* and *p*, *m* and *n*, *l* and *r*, *n* and *l*, *n* and *r* (very uncommon), *a*, *y*, *m*, or *r*, or *k*, with gutturals, and palatals, interchanging in almost every possible way. One great peculiarity of the Peshitto is the frequency with which the proper names are translated and the large number of cases of the transposition of letters. This statement is based on a collection of the variation of the proper names of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, made and possessed by myself in manuscript. There are over two thousand variants in this collection. The Samaritan Targum scarcely varies at all in sense from the Samaritan-Hebrew original. Its variants are mostly in the gutturals which are used almost indiscriminately. This statement is based upon a concordance made by myself with the assistance of Prof. Jesse L. Cotton, D.D., Rev. Robert Robinson, and Rev. C. D. Brokenshire. The variations of Jerome's version arose mostly from a vowel pointing different from the Massoritic. The textual variations of the Targums are similar to those of the Hebrew manuscripts and of the Massoritic readings. See Cappelus: *Critica Sacra* II, 858-892.

Josephus, Philo, and the Zadokite Fragments carry us back to the year 40 to 100 A. D. These citations show that those who used them had our present text with but slight variations. The numerous citations in the Hebrew of the Zadokite Fragments are especially valuable as a confirmation of the Hebrew text of Amos and other books cited.[77]

5. The Septuagint version, the citations of Ecclesiasticus, the Book of Jubilees, and other pre-Christian literature, carry us back to about 300 B. C.[78]

---

[77] Thus we find that the Zadokite Fragments cite the canonical books 226 times; 13 times from Genesis, 7 Ex., 29 Lev., 20 Num., 23 Deut. (92 Pentateuch); 3 Joshua, 3 Judges, 6 Samuel, 2 Kings, 30 Is., 9 Jer., 16 Ezek., 9 Hos., 2 Amos, 1 Ob., 7 Mi., 1 Na., 3 Zech., 4 Mal. (Minor Prophets 27); 13 Ps., 1 Ru., 10 Prov., 3 Job, 1 Lam., 1 Est., 4 Dan., 2 Ezra, 1 Neh., 3 Chron. (That is, all the O. T. books except Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs.) Some of these citations agree exactly with the consonants of our *textus receptus;* some differ slightly, some considerably; but they all indicate that the present text is substantially the same as that which was in existence when the book of Zadok was written. That Philo had the text of our Old Testament before him will be manifest to anyone who reads a page or two of Ryle's *Philo and Holy Scripture,* which gives Philo's citations from the canonical books of the Jews. For the New Testament, Toy's work on New Testament Quotations, shows plainly the same thing. As for Josephus, he himself claims that his *Antiquities* is based on the sacred writings of the Israelites and the writings demonstrate the truth of his statement.

[78] The differences between the Hebrew Massoritic text and the Greek Septuagint are often grossly exaggerated. The vast majority of them arise merely from a difference of pointing of the same consonantal text. The real variants arose from errors of sight such as those between *r* and *d*, *k* and *b*, *y* and *w*, or from errors of sound such as between gutturals, labials, palatals, sibilants, and dentals, or from different interpretations of abbrevia-

6. For the Pentateuch, the present Samaritan-Hebrew text (which has been transmitted for 2,300 years or more, by copyists adverse to Rabbinical and Massoritic influences) agrees substantially with the received text of our Hebrew Bibles. Most of the variants are the same in character as those which we find in the transmission of all originals and especially in the transmission of our Hebrew text itself.[79] This carries the text back at the latest to about 400 B. C.

7. The Hebrew Scriptures contain the names of 26

---

tions. There is a goodly number of transpositions, some dittographies, many additions or omissions, sometimes of significant consonants, but almost all in unimportant words and phrases. Most of the additions seem to have been for elucidation of the original. In the case of Jeremiah we have in the Greek a recension which excludes many recurrent phrases. It may be compared with the Babylonian and Aramaic recension of the Behistun inscription as contrasted with the Persian and Susian. While substantially the same, they vary in many particulars.—For the Old Testament citations and allusions of Ben-Sira, see my article on "The Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus" in the *Pres. and Ref. Review* for 1900.—For the Book of Jubilees, see the collection of variants by R. H. Charles in the *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* of the Old Testament, II 5, 6. Prof. Charles has gathered only 25 variants, 8 of single consonants, 1 of transposition of words, 9 of omission of a word and 1 of a phrase, 2 cases of change of gender, 1 of number, and 3 inexplicable corruptions. The result of his investigation is a wonderful corroboration of the substantial correctness of our present Hebrew text.

[79] See Gesenius', *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine,* the standard work on this subject; and, also, the able criticism of the work of Gesenius by J. Iverach Munro, entitled, *The Samaritan Pentateuch.* See also a review of Petermann's *Pentateuchus Samaritanus* by R. D. Wilson in *Pres. and Ref. Review,* III, 199, and J. E. H. Thomson, D.D., *The Samaritans: their Testimony to the Religion of Israel,* and J. A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans.*

or more foreign kings whose names have been found on documents contemporary with the kings. The names of most of these kings are found to be spelled on their own monuments, or in documents from the time in which they reigned in the same manner that they are spelled in the documents of the Old Testament. The changes in the spelling of others are in accordance with the laws of phonetic change as those laws were in operation at the time when the Hebrew documents claim to have been written. In the case of two or three names only are there letters, or spellings, that cannot as yet be explained with certainty; but even in these few cases it cannot be shown that the spelling in the Hebrew text is wrong. Contrariwise, the names of many of the kings of Judah and Israel are found on the Assyrian contemporary documents with the same spelling as that which we find in the present Hebrew text.

The names of Chedorlaomer and his confederates are written in the Hebrew as follows: Amraphel (אמרפל), Chedorlaomer (כדרלעמר), Arioch (אריוך), and Tidal (תדעל). The first name is undoubtedly meant to denote Hammurabi, king of Babylon, and is to be divided into *'ammu, rapi* and *ili*. The first syllable is usually written in Babylonian *ḫa* but there are cases where it is written *'a*.[80] The *l* at the end

[80] See notes in King's *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, LXVI and 253.

stands for *ilu* "god."[81] This word *ilu* is found at the end of the names of other kings of the same dynasty as Hammurabi, such as *Sumula-ilu, Samsu-ilu-na,* and also of persons not kings as *Šumman-la-ilu.*[82] The omission of the Aleph from אֵל ('el) is found also in the Hebrew of the אֵח ('aḥ) of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon. As to the names of the other kings, no one can deny that they are *spelled* correctly. For *Kudur* occurs in names of the time of Hammurabi[83] and *Laomer* occurs in Ashurbanipal's list of the gods of Elam.[84] The *Kudur-Lakhgumal* of Pinches inscription[85] is certainly the same as the

[81] *Id.* LXVI. In British Museum Document No. 33212, *ilu* occurs before the name.

[82] King: *Letters, etc.,* III, pp. 21, 215, 241.

[83] King: *Id.* I. LV.

[84] See Streck: *Assurbanipal* II, 52. La-go-ma-ru (Annals VI. 33).

[85] KB II 205. In an article on the gods of Elam by M. H. de Genouillac in the *Receuil de Travaux,* xxvii, 94 f, we learn that the Elamite way of spelling the name was *La-ga-mar,* M. Francois Martin in his *Textes Religieux* gives the spellings as *La-ga-ma-al* (for which he cites two cases) and *La-ga-mar* (for which he cites two cases). Ashurbanipal spells the name *La-ga-ma-ru* (V. R. 6a, 33). The LXX gives it as Χοδολλογομόρ, having assimilated the first *r* to the following *l.* The name appears already in the time of Kutur-Nahhunti and again in an inscription of his brother, Shilhak-in-Shushinak. A son of Kutur-Nahhunti was called Shilhina-hamru-Lagamar (in three different texts), and Shutruru speaks of him as "the great."—King in his *History of Babylon,* p. 113, gives 2282 B. C. as the date of Kutur-Nahhunti (whose name he spells Kutur-Nankhumdi) and about 2080 B. C. as that of Hammurabi (*id.* 111). See also Scheil in the *Memoires of the Delegation en Perse,* Tome III, *Textes Élamites-Anzanites,* p. 49; and Deimel in the *Pantheon Babylonicum, Nomina Deorum, etc.,* Romae 1914, p. 160 f.

Kudur-Laomer of Gen. xiv. The changes of the gutturals and palatals and of *l* and *r* are common ones in the transliterations of languages. Thus Babylonian *l* equals Persian *r*, Hebrew *l* equals Egyptian *r*;[86] Hebrew ע (') often equals Egyptian and Greek *g*, and Babylonian ḫ.[87] In Tidal the ע (') is regular for ח (ḫ), as in the first letter of Omri. In Arioch the consonants are exact equivalents of the like word in Sumerian. No one can doubt therefore, that the Hebrew text of the proper names may have been written in the time of Hammurabi; and that, whenever it was written, it has been handed down correctly to our times. The very disputes about these names are the very strongest corroborations of the general belief of all critics in the accurate transmission of the Hebrew text. In the twenty consonants of these four names we have, therefore, twenty witnesses to the correctness of the Hebrew textus receptus.

The five kings of Egypt are: Shishak (שׁשׁק), So (סוא), Tirhakah (תרהקה), Necho (נכו), and Hophra (חפרע), reigning at intervals from 1000 to 600 B. C. There are here 18 consonants in the Hebrew text and they represent 18 consonants in the *cartouches* of the kings named. Here we have one of the most re-

[86] In the case of *Laomer* the changes of *l* and *r* are found on the documents of Elam, Babylon, and Assyria.

[87] Thus עזה = Gaza in Greek and Gadatu in Egyptian. See Breasted: *Egypt* II. 179, Schrader in *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 107.3, 161.27, 256.3, and Knudtzon's *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, 289.17, 33, 40 (but also, *Azzati* in 296.32).

markable instances of exact transmission of proper names on record. For first, the guttural consonants, א, ה, ח, and ע, the palatals and *r* all represent the same letters in the original. The only changes from the original are the assimilation of the *n* in Sheshank, the adding of the vowel letter ה at the end of Tirhakah, the changing of *sh* to *s* and of *b* to *w* in *So,* and the change of *b* to *p* in Hophra,—all changes in harmony with the general laws of variations in sounds in the passing from one language to another.[87a]

[87a] These statements about the names of the kings of Egypt mentioned in the Old Testament are based especially upon a study of the comparative values of the consonantal signs as exhibited in the inscriptions of Thothmes III on the gates of his temple at Thebes (Karnak). There exist still three lists of the cities of Palestine and Syria which Thothmes conquered. They have been edited and compared with the original Hebrew names, which they purport to render, by Prof. W. Max Müller of the University of Pennsylvania in his work entitled *Die Palästinaliste Thutmosis III.* From these lists we gather the Egyptian way of expressing the Hebrew *h, q* (k), *n,* and *r*. Budge in his *First Steps in Egyptian* gives us on pages 9-11 the signs for *ta, ka, sha*(š), *ab, ra*'. Using the signs in the cartouches of the kings and comparing them with the letters used in our Hebrew Bible for spelling the same names we find that they are exactly equivalent except that the Hebrews according to their custom assimilate the *n* in Shishak, add the vowel letter *h* at the end of Torhakah, change the labials in Hophra and So and drop the *ka* in So. Taking up these variations according to the apparent difficulty of explanation, we find that *ka* occurs in fifteen of the names of kings of Ethiopia (Petrie, *History of Egypt* III. 280-311). According to Brugsch, this *ka* is in Ethiopic the post-fixed article. If so, it would not be used in proper names in either Assyrian or Hebrew. The *w* in *Siw*' is changed from *b* as in Bath-Shu'a for Bath-Sheba. Sargon in Khorsabad inscription I.

The kings of Assyria are Tiglath-pileser (פלאסר תגלת), Shalmaneser (שלמנאסר), Sargon (סרגון), Sennacherib (סנחריב), and Esarhaddon (אסרחדן); and the kings of Babylon Merodachbaladan (בלאדן מרדך), Nebuchadrezzar (נבוכדרצר), Evil-Merodach (אויל מרדך) and Belshazzar (בלשצר). These words contain 63 letters of which 59 are consonants. Comparing these consonants with those of the originals we find that the only changes in the Hebrew text contrary to general rules consist in the spelling Shalmaneser instead of Salmanezer and the assimilation or dropping of *r* in the *sha(r)* of Belshazzar.[88] As to the rendering of the Assyrian *sh* by *sh* it is to be noted

---

25, 26 calls him Sib-'.-e. The ' (א) at the end in Hebrew is the proper vowel letter for the Egyptian vowel in *ba*.

In Hophra we have a *p* where the Egyptian has *b*. But the Greek of Herodotus has *p* and Manetho has *ph*. It is noteworthy that the Hebrew alone renders correctly the gutturals ח and ע. While the Hebrew text correctly keeps the ח in the beginning the Targum has changed it to ה the article and translated the word as the unfortunate; the Syriac agrees with the Targum and renders by "the lame." The Hebrew *kah* at the end of Tishakah is certainly better than the Babylonian *ku*, the Hebrews having read the sign as *ka* and heightened the *ă* to *ā* at the end of the word and then written the vowel letter as usual.

[88] For the latter compare the confusion of שמע and שמר by the Septuagint translators and the falling out or assimilation of *r* in the examples given in Lidzbarski's *Epigraphik*, p. 393. Compare also, the assimilation of the *r* to *l* in the Greek Chodollogomar; and also, the dropping of the *r* in the Assyrian transliterations of Egyptian names given in Assurbanipal's *Annals* I, 90-109, e. g., Mimpi for Mn-nfr, Pisaptu for Pr-spd, Punubu for Pr-ub; and the not infrequent change of *r* to *l*, or *l* to *r*, in the LXX, or the change of Egyptian *b* to *p*.

that this is the way in which this particular root שלם is always written in both the Aramaic and Canaanitish dialects.[89] The writing in Daniel of Nebuchadnezzar for Nebuchadrezzar, involving the change of *r* to *n*, may be explained either by assuming that the former is the Aramaic form of the latter, or that the *r* is changed to *n* as in the example given in Lidbarski.[90]

The four names of Achæmenid kings found in the Scriptures are Cyrus (כרש), Darius (דריוש), Ahasuerus (אחשורוש), and Artaxerxes (ארתחשסתא), of which the last part is written also ששת and ששתא. The *Aleph* in Xerxes is prosthetic as in the word *satrap* (אחשדרפן) and the final *Aleph* as found in cer-

[89] This appears from numerous examples in Lidzbarski's *Epigraphik*, pp. 376, 377, for Phenician, Punic, Hebrew, Nabatean, Palmyrene, and Egypto-Aramaic. For the *eser* the Assyrian has *asaridu*. Assyrian proper names were frequently shortened even to only one part out of three or more. See Tallquist: *Neubabylonisches Namenbuch* xiv-xxxiii. Compare, also, the Shalman of Hos. x. 14 and the Jareb of Hos. v. 13, x. 6, and the Nadinu of the Babylonian Chronicle (K. B. II. 274) for Nabu-nadin-zir. (Winckler: *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 110.) If the full form of the name was Shalman-ašaridu-Ašur, the forms used in the Assyrian documents and in the Hebrew text would both be accounted for.

[90] *Epigraphik*, pp. 329, 393. See also my *Studies on the Book of Daniel*, p. 167, note. Since in Babylonia both *kuduru* and *kidinu* mean servant, it is possible that the latter was used by Jeremiah and Daniel to show that they interpreted *kuduru* as meaning servant rather than boundary. Again, both names might be shorter forms of Nabu-kudur-kidini-uṣur O Nebo, protect the boundary of the servant. Or, the *n* may be the Hebrew and old Aramaic (Nerab) form of the Imperative with the *r* assimilated. Compare Note 88.

tain spellings of the name Artaxerxes is *otiant*. The *Wau* in Xerxes is a contraction of *yama*. In the case of Artaxerxes the dental and sibilant are transposed in accordance with general Semitic laws of dental and sibilants. In the Sachau Papyri from the fifth century B. C. the names are written כרש, דריוש (or דריהיש, דריוהוש), חשירש, and ארתחשסש. In Babylonian the *Wau* in Darius is commonly written *m*, Xerxes has often a prosthetic vowel, and Artaxerxes is written in the Babylonian recension of the original inscription Artaksatsu (or with an *ḫ* instead of *k*).[91] Thus we see that every one of the 22 consonants composing the names of the kings of Persia mentioned in the Bible has been transmitted correctly to us over a space 23 or 24 hundred years. It may be added that in no other non-Persian document are they so accurately transliterated.[91a]

---

[91] See Weissbach's *Keilinschiften der Achaemeniden*, and Strassmaier's *Inschiften von Darius* and numerous tablets in CT and VASD.

[91a] Critics who hold that Esther and Ezra were not composed till after 300 B. C. and that both authors gained largely from Greek sources their information about the times which they describe will have a hard time explaining the way in which Xerxes is spelled in Ezra iv. 6, and in the book of Esther throughout. According to all known cases of transliteration, אחשורש cannot possibly be a transliteration of Xerxes. The *X* of the Greek is commonly transliterated in Hebrew, Aramaic and Syriac by *ks* (כס) and infrequently by *ḳs* (קס); *ḫ* (ח) and *sh* (ש) being never used. Thus *Xerx* (for *es* is the Greek ending) could never become *'ḫšwrš*. [In Dalman's *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Wörtesbuch* there are nouns with כס and with אכס and with קס and with אקס corresponding to the Greek X or ξ, but not one with חס, אחס, הש or אחש.

Other kings of foreign countries mentioned in the Bible and also on contemporary documents outside the Bible are Hazael (חזהאל), and Rezin (רצין), of Damascus, Hiram (חירם), and Ethbaal (אתבעל) of

---

The same is true of the Syraic words in Brockelmann's *Lexicon Syriacum.* On the other hand, if the writers of these lived in the fifth century B. C. in the Persian court, they could not have transliterated better than they have done. For Xerxes in Persian is kšayarša, the exact equivalent of חשורש, to which the Hebrew adds a prosthetic Aleph, as is done in the case of the Aramaic אחשרוש, *satrap* (Daniel vi. 4) and אחשתרן *camel* (?) (Esther viii. 10, 14) and most commonly in Babylonian and also in the Syriac אחשירש (Peshitto of Esther i. 1), and Bar Hebraeus: *Chronicon Syriacum* p. 31 (Paris edition of 1890, sold by Maisonneuve). If we accept the Massoritic vowel pointing in Dan. ix. 1 a Xerxes or Ahasuerus is referred to there also. If, however, we point as 'Oḥšaruš, we would have the Hebrew of the king of Media whom the Greeks called Cyaxares, and the Persians uuakštra. The name occurs in Persian only twice and both times in the genitive uuakštrahyā (Behistun §§ 24, 33)].

Artaxerxes, also, is in the Bible as exact a transliteration of the Persian way of writing the name, as is possible. The first part of the name is written in the Persian inscription *arda* once (vase a), and *arta* nine times. The Elamitic follows the Persian even in the change of *d* and *t;* but Hebrew, Aramaic, Babylonian and Greek always write *t.* The Persian *k* is always rendered by *k* in Elamitic and Greek (the first part of *ks);* in Babylonian it is represented by a *k* except in vase *a* where we have 'ḫ; in Hebrew and Aramaic we always have ḫ. The letter following *k* is in Persian on vase *a* ǩ but everywhere else š; in Elamitic, Babylonian, Egypto and biblical Aramaic and Hebrew, always š; in Greek the *s* part of ξ. The last syllable is in Persian *šǩa* or the sign denoted by an *r* with an *s* over it and *a* following it. Elamitic denotes this syllable by *šša,* Babylonian by *ssu* (vases a, b, c) or tsu; Egypto-Aramaic by שש, biblical Aramaic by שתא (Ezra iv. 7 *bis,* 8, 11, 23, vi. 14) and biblical Hebrew by סתא (Ezra vii. 1, 7, 11, 12, 21; viii. 1; Neh. ii. 1; xiii. 6), the *s* and *t* being transposed in accordance with the general rule that

Tyre, משע of Moab, and Hadadezer (הדדעזר). These names contain at least 24 consonants, and every one of them has the proper writing in our Hebrew Bibles. In fact, Hadad (הדד), and Ethbaal (אתבעל) are spelled more correctly in the Hebrew text than they are in the Assyrian records.[92]

Again, there are at least six kings of Israel and four of Judah whose names are found in the Assyrian records, to wit: Omri (עמרי), Ahab (אחאב), Jehu (יהוא), Menahem (מנחם), Pekah (פקח), Hoshea (הושע), Azariah (עזריה), Ahaz (אחז), Hezekiah (חזקיהו), and Manasseh (מנשה). By comparing the Assyrian renditions of the letters it will be found that the whole 40 are written in our Hebrew Bibles in a manner corresponding to the proper transliteration of the Assyrian texts.

Thus we find that in 143 cases of transliteration

---

where a dental comes before a sibilant the two consonants change places. Ezra iv. 7 gives the whole syllable as *šta'*. The Greek gives the syllable as *ξης*, transposing the letters *sk* into *ks* and adding the Greek ending *es;* but the *r* of the syllable *Xer* has no equivalent in Persian, or any other contemporaneous language. That *yama* should contract to *wau* (or ô) seems clear when we remember that *yama* is equivalent to *yawa* and that the *m* of Babylonian may change to *w* in West Semitic, as in *Saos* for *Shamash* in the name of the king Shamash-šum-ukin as given in Ptolemy's Canon. It appears from the above evidence that the Bible, especially in the whole writing of Ezra iv. 7, presents the best transliteration possible of the original Persian name as spelled in the native inscription of the monarch himself.

[92] For a detailed discussion of the evidence see KAT and Lidzbarski's *Epigraphik*.

from Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian and Moabite into Hebrew and in 40 cases of the opposite, or 184 in all, the evidence shows that for 2300 to 3900 years the text of the proper names in the Hebrew Bible has been transmitted with the most minute accuracy. That the original scribes should have written them with such close conformity to correct philological principles is a wonderful proof of their thorough care and scholarship; further, that the Hebrew text should have been transmitted by copyists through so many centuries is a phenomenon unequalled in the history of literature.

For neither the assailants nor the defenders of the biblical text should assume for one moment that either this accurate rendition or this correct transmission of proper names is an easy or usual thing. And as some of my readers may not have experience in investigating such matters, attention may be called to the names of the kings of Egypt as given in Manetho and on the Egyptian monuments. Manetho was a high priest of the idol-temples in Egypt in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, i. e., about 280 B. C. He wrote a work on the dynasties of Egyptian kings, of which fragments have been preserved in the works of Josephus, Eusebius, and others. Of the kings of the 31 dynasties, he gives 140 names from 22 dynasties. Of these, 49 appear on the monuments in a form in which every consonant of Manetho's spelling may possibly be recognized, and 28 more may be

recognized in part. The other 63 are unrecognizable in any single syllable. If it be true that Manetho himself copied these lists from the original records—and the fact that he is substantially correct in 49 cases corroborates the supposition that he did,—the hundreds of variations and corruptions in the fifty or more unrecognizable names must be due either to his fault in copying or to the mistakes of the transmitters of his text.[93] But, perhaps, the most striking example of the difficulty of transmitting accurately the proper names of kings, as well as the precariousness of using these lists as evidence against the Scriptures, is to be found in the lists of kings given by the astronomer Ptolemy in his *Canon*. Of the twenty-two kings that reigned over Babylon from Nabonassar to Nabunaid inclusive, Ptolemy mentions but eighteen; and of the eighteen kings from Cyrus to Darius Codomannus, the names of eight are omitted.

This deficiency in the Ptolemaic *Canon* will be the more apparent when we observe that between the death of *Nergal-shar-uṣur* in 556 B. C. and the accession of Darius II in 424 B. C., i. e., in 132 years, the *Canon* gives the names and length of reigns of only six kings of Babylon, whereas the classics and

[93] Of the 27 kings of Egypt named by Josephus, only seven are spelled the same as in Manetho. Of the 41 kings of Assyria in the lists of Africanus, only one name is recognizable and it is misspelled. In Ptolemy's list of 18 kings of Babylon, only one is spelled exactly right. See my article on *Darius the Mede* in PTR for 1922.

monuments give the names, and in most cases, the approximate lengths of the reigns of nine others.

Now, Ptolemy and those who copied his *Canon* have been very careful in copying the notation of the number of years. It is different, however, when we look at the proper names. Thus, of the eighteen names of the kings of Babylon from Nabonassar to Nabunaid, only the first and last, and that of Esarhaddon are written with approximate correctness. That their difference may be patent to the eye of our readers, I shall give the names in interlinear transliteration, the first line as given in the *Canon,* the second as we find the name on the Babylonian monuments:

1 Nabonassarou	2 Nadiou	3 Chinzirou kai Porou
1 Nabunasir	2 Nabu-nadin-zir	3 Ukinzir and Pulu
4 Iougaiou	5 Mardokempadou	6 Arkianou
4 Ululai	5 Marduk-aplu-iddin	6 Shar-ukin
7 Belibou	8 Apronadiou	9 Rigebelou
7 Belibni	8 Ashur-nadin-shum	9 Nergal-ushezib
10 Mesessimordakou	11 Assaradinou	12 Saosdoucheou
10 Mushezib-Marduk	11 Āshur-ahi-iddin	12 Shamash-shum-ukin
13 Xuniladanou	14 Nabokolassarou	15 Nabokolassarou
13 Kandalanu	14 Nabu-aplu-usur	15 Nabu-kudur-usur
16 Ilouarodamou	17 Nirikassolassarou	18 Nabonadiou
16 Amel-Marduk	17 Nergal-shar-usur	18 Nabu-na'id

Another example of the difficulty of transmitting proper names is to be found in the life of Alexander by the Pseudo-Callisthenes. Concerning this work the late President Woolsey of Yale College has truly said, that in the Greek manuscripts and in the versions "proper names assume different forms at will,"

and there is "an amazing difference in the proper names." "A daughter-in-law of Queen Candace is called Harpussa by B and C, Matersa by A, and Margie by V." "In the list of combatants in the games the Syriac has nine names like the Greek and Latin authorities, but they are all so much altered that two or three only have any resemblance.[94]

Thus we see not merely analogical evidence but the direct evidence of the documents forces us to the conclusion that the spelling of the proper names of the kings as given in the Old Testament must go back to original sources; and if the original sources were in the hands of the composers of the documents, the probability is that since the composers are correct in the spelling of the names of the kings they are correct also in the sayings and deeds which they record concerning these kings. And this we find in general to be true where the Hebrew documents and the monuments both record the great deeds of the kings. Thus the Hebrew Scriptures mention the expedition of Shishak against Judah, and the Egyptian records at Thebes record the conquest of Judah by the same king. The Assyrian monuments speak of the wars of Tiglath-Pileser, Shalmaneser, Sargon, and Sen-

[94] See for the evidence in full the article of President Woolsey entitled: Notice of a Life of Alexander the Great translated from the Syriac by Rev. Dr. Justin Perkins, New Haven, 1854, in Reprint from the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. IV, 359-440.

nacherib; the Hebrew documents record the same events generally in the same order and with the like results. Mesha says that he asserted his independence of Ahab; the Scriptures say that he rebelled against Israel. From the mouths of many witnesses —for in this case every consonant gives out a voice of testimony—the Hebrew documents are corroborated. The great kings come up from the south and the greater kings come down from the north, and the little kings of Tyre and Damascus and Moab and Israel and Judah meet them in the slash and clash of battle and the kings record their victories on the pyla of Thebes, on the cliffs of Behistun, on the stones of Moab, on the high built walls of their palaces and tombs; and the great kings and the small go alike the inevitable way of all flesh. But they did not live in vain. For their deeds and their very names speak out to-day in confirmation of the history of that little, oft conquered, nation whose God was Jehovah and whose oracles were the oracles of God.

8. The names of these kings—about forty in all—are the names of men who lived from about 2000 to about 400 B. C., and yet they each and all appear in proper chronological order both with reference to the kings of the same country and with respect to the kings of other countries contemporary with them. No stronger evidence for the substantial accuracy of the Old Testament records could possibly be imagined than this collection of names of kings. It means that

out of 56 kings of Egypt from Shishak to Darius II, and out of the numerous kings of Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Tyre, Damascus, Moab, Israel, and Judah, that ruled from 2000 to 400 B. C., the writers of the Old Testament have put the names of the 40 or more that are mentioned in records of two or more of the nations, in their proper absolute and relative order of time and in their proper place. Any expert mathematician will tell you, that to do such a thing is practically impossible without a knowledge of the facts such as could be drawn alone from contemporary and reliable records. When we consider that there are nine distinct lines of kings in the countries mentioned, and that there are several hundred kings in all, and that the length of the reigns of the kings could be determined only from the most accurate records, the chance of anyone who did not have access to reliable sources to get a record as exact as that preserved for us in the Hebrew Scriptures would be so small that no mathematician on earth could calculate it.[94a]

9. The proper names and laws and customs of the

[94a] If there were 300 names of kings, each reigning 20 years, and 40 to be taken by chance, then, according to the algebraic rule that $n\ (n-1)\ (n-2)\ldots(n-r+1)$ equals the number of permutations, there would be one chance in about 75 x 1,000,000 to the 16th power of getting the names in the correct order. Even this chance would be made more impossible from the fact that the kings did not all reign an equal and synchronous period, but for periods of from one month to 66 years. See Wells' *Higher Algebra,* page 362.

time of Abraham are such as are met with in the extra-biblical records from the time of Hammurabi, of whom Abraham, according to Gen. xiv was a contemporary.[95]

10. The proper names and customs of the story of Joseph harmonize with the time when Joseph is said to have been in Egypt.[96]

11. The proper names of the Samaria ostraka and the names and events recorded on the Moabite stone agree with the biblical records of the time of Ahab.[97]

12. Moreover, the kinds of foreign words embedded in the different documents of the Old Testament argue strongly for the genuineness and for the accurate transmission of this original text.

In order that the force of this kind of evidence may be fully appreciated, let me here say that the time at which any document of length, and often even of small compass, was written can generally be determined by the character of its vocabulary, and especially by the foreign words which are embedded in it. Take, for example, the various Aramaic documents. The inscriptions from Northern Syria having been written in Assyrian times bear evident marks of Assyrian, Phœnician, and even Hebrew words. The Egyptian papyri from Persian times have numerous

[95] See my article in the *Bible Student* for 1904. In reading the article please bear in mind that the proof was never revised by the author.

[96] See Pinches: *The Old Testament*, etc., pp. 249-267.

[97] See Lyon in *Harvard Review* for 1911, p. 136.

words of Egyptian, Babylonian, and Persian origin, as have also the Aramaic parts of Ezra and Daniel. The Nabatean Aramaic having been written probably by Arabs is strongly marked, especially in its proper names, by Arab words. The Palmyrene, Syriac, and Rabbinical Aramaic, from the time of the Græco-Roman domination, have hundreds of terms introduced from Greek and Latin. Bar Hebræus and other writings after the Mohammedan conquest have numerous Arabic expressions, and the modern Syriac of Ouroumiah has many words of Persian, Kurdish, and Turkish origin.

Now, if the Biblical history be true, we shall expect to find Babylonian words in the early chapters of Genesis and Egyptian in the later; and so on down, an ever-changing influx of new words from the languages of the ever-changing dominating powers. And, as a matter of fact, this is exactly what we find. Thus, the first chapters of Genesis contain proper and common names of Sumerian or Babylonian origin,[98] and the Pentateuch has many Egyptian words.[99] In the time of Solomon, whose mother had been the wife of Uriah the Hittite and whose commerce included products from all countries, and whose empire extended from the Euphrates to the borders of Egypt,

---

[98] E. g., Adam, Abel, Abraham, Arioch; and בחו, תהום, ברא (= Sumerian ba-ru (?)), בנה, אד (in sense of "form").

[99] E. g. Ramases, Pithom, On, Potiphar, Asenath; סין, גמא, תבה, סוף, זרת.

we find in the narrative, words of Hittite, Indian and Assyrian origin.[100] In the documents from the eighth to the sixth century we find predominantly foreign words of Syrian, Assyrian and Babylonian character.[101] And in the records from the sixth century to the end we find Babylonian, Persian, and a few Greek words.[102]

13. The Old Testament documents claim that records were written by Moses,[103] by Joshua,[104] by Deborah,[105] by a young man of Succoth,[106] by Samuel,[107] by David,[108] and either by, or in the days

[100] Thus, פתגם and פרדס have their nearest analogies in Armenian, the closest of the Indo-Europeans to the ancient Hittites (see Meyer in *Encyclopedia Brittanica,* art. "Persia"). The names for apes and elephants (1 Kings xi. 22) are of Indian origin תכי = *iba* (Burnouf *Sanskrit Dict.* p. 89), קפי = *Kapi,* (*id.* p. 140). And זבל, פחת, סגן and היכל came from the Assyro-Babylonian (or from the Sumerian through the Babylonian).

[101] E. g. Hazael, Benhadad, Tiglath-Pileser, Merodach-Baladan, Bel, Nebo, Tartan, Rabshakeh.

[102] E. g. Zerubbabbel, Sheshbazzar, Sanballat, and many names of officers, offices, and things are Babylonian, and the names of musical instruments in the Aramaic of Daniel are Greek. (See my article in Biblical and Theological Studies by the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, p. 261 (1912).) On the Persian words, see Tisdale, *"The Book of Daniel; Some Linguistic Evidence Regarding Its Date."*

[103] Thus, JE in Ex. xvii. 14, xxxii. 82, xxiv. 12, xxxiv. 17; D in Deut. x. 4, iv. 13, v. 19, x. 2, xxviii. 61, xxxi. 9, *22*; P in Num. xxxiii. 2, Ex. xxxix. 30.

[104] Josh. viii. 32, xviii. 4, xxiv. 26.

[105] Judg. v. 14.

[106] Judg. viii. 14.

[107] 1 Sam. x. 25.

[108] 2 Sam. xi. 14, 15.

of, all the kings of Israel and Judah from Solomon to Zedekiah. For thousands of years before the time of Moses, the Egyptians on the southward of Palestine and the Babylonians on the east had been writing documents similar in form and content to those found in the Pentateuch. For thousands of years before Moses, the Babylonians had been making expeditions and carrying their culture to the coasts of the Mediterranean. For hundreds of years before his time, kings of Egypt had been raiding Palestine, and her merchants and travelers had been frequenting her ports and inland cities and leaving the records of their transactions in their tales and autobiographies. The Tel-el-Amarna letters, written to the kings of Egypt from every part of Palestine and Syria, show that writing in cuneiform was practised everywhere in these countries 200 years before the time of Moses.[109] And the tablets from Taanach, Gezer, and elsewhere show that such writings were

---

[109] That the Hebrew of the text may have been written as early as the time of Exodus is proven, (1) by the Hebrew words embedded in the Tel-el-Amarna Letters; (2) by the proper names in the Egyptian lists of places conquered in Palestine; and (3) by the proper names of the Hammurabi period. This evidence shows also that the forms of the noun and verb as found in Biblical Hebrew were already in existence. See Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe;* W. Max Müller, *Die Palästinaliste Thutmosis III;* Clay, *Light on the O. T. from Babylon,* p. 147; Ranke, *Early Babylonian Personal Names;* and Knudtzon: *Die El-Amarna Tafeln,* 1545-1549.

still made as late as 600 B. C. Various documents in Phenician, Aramaic, Hittite, Cypriote, Cretan, Moabite, Minæan, Sabean, and Hebrew, from 1000 B. C. to 400 B. C., show that during all this period documents of various kinds were in use among the nations of western Asia in, and on every side, of Palestine. The character of the documents shows also that there must have been a general diffusion among the people of the ability to read and write. In view of all these facts, the *sang froid* with which these modern critics and their followers affirm that writings could not have been produced among the Hebrews till 800 or 900 B. C. passes belief. Against the express and reiterated statements of the biblical records that writing was in use among the Hebrews from Moses downward, supported as these statements are by all the direct evidence of the documents of all the surrounding nations, they set up their *opinion*—an opinion that receives no support from the documents, until they have been arbitrarily amended and interpreted in order to bring them into harmony with the *a priori* opinions which on the face of them the documents themselves clearly condemn.

II. Evidence from Analogy

The testimony supplied by the history of the transmission of the text of other ancient documents, supported as it is by what we know of the transmission

of the text of the Old Testament for the last 2,000 years, justifies the presumption that the copies of the Old Testament text existent 2,000 years ago had in like manner been transmitted from their originals. Thus—

1. The fragments of classical writers found in the papyri of Egypt when compared with modern printed editions based on manuscripts, many of which are not a thousand years old show that, with few important variations, the classical authors have been correctly transmitted for 2,000 to 2,500 years. In the fragments of 150 lines from Homer in the papyri from Oxyrynchus, the Fayum and Hibeh, edited by Grenfell, Hunt, and others, many lines are exactly the same as in the edition of Munro Allen. Most of the variants are merely slight such as adding *n,* or putting *e* for *ei.* In the two fragments of Herodotus, from the end of the third century A. D., published in the Oxyrynchus Papyri, there is no variant from Dietsch's edition, though there are a few minor variations from Stein's edition.

2. The building inscriptions of Nabunaid refer to the fact that certain temples had been built by Hammurabi, who reigned over Babylon 1,500 years before his time, saying that he had found the *temens* or foundation stones of Hammurabi. In the copies of records of Hammurabi which were made about 650 B. C. for the library of Ashurbanipal, king of

Assyria, and preserved in Nineveh, mention is made of the founding of these temples.[110]

3. The library of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh had thousands of documents that were copies of originals going back hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of years before his time.[111]

4. Some parts of the Egyptian Book of the Dead were in use in the same form for nearly 4,000 years.[112]

---

[110] See the *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* III, 11, 91, and King's *Letters of Hammurabi,* pp. 181-3. An inscription of Hammurabi in Sumerian says among other things: "When Shamash gave unto him Shumer and Accad to rule and entrusted their sceptre to his hands, then did (Hammurabi) build for Shamash, the lord who is the protector of his life, the temple Ebabbar, his beloved temple, in Larsam, the city of his rule." (King: *Inscriptions of Hammurabi,* p. 182.) In another inscription we read: "Hammurabi, the mighty king, the king of Babylon, king of the four quarters of the world, hath built Ebabbar, the temple of Shamash in the city of Larsam" (*id.* 183). Referring to this temple Nabunaid says, that in his tenth year Shamash commanded him to restore Ebarra. He says that he found the *temen* and plan of the temple inscribed with the name of Hammurabi, "the old-time king who, 700 years before Burnaburiash, Ebarra and its Zikurat upon the old *temen* had built to Shamash. (KB. III. II. 0. Col. I. 54. II. 1-60, 1-32.) An inscription of Burnaburiash states that he restored the same temple of Ebarra. KB. III. II. 153.

[111] See Dennefeld: *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geburts-omina,* p. 9. 3, on the Entstehungszeit, Entstehungs-und Ueberlieferungsart des Originalwerkes; also, Hunger: *Beckenwahrsagung bei den Babyloniern und Assyriern,* II. 503 f.

[112] A tradition as old as the twelfth dynasty says that chapter XXX B of the *Book of the Dead* was discovered by Herutataf the son of Khufu in the reign of Menkaura, a king of the fourth dynasty. It was cut in hieroglyphics and set under the feet of Thoth. This prayer was still recited by the Egyptians in the

5. Scores of duplicates and triplicates among the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Egyptian documents show that from 2000 B. C. down to the year 400 B. C. copies of documents were often made with absolute exactness and generally with substantial accuracy.[113]

6. The variants in these duplicates show clearly, however, that differences in spelling, enumeration, and even omissions and additions, etc., are no proof in themselves of a difference in either age or authorship.[114] Examples of the different ways of spelling will be seen in the lists of Thothmes III at Karnak. Thirty-five variants occur in 119 names.[115] In the 17 lines of tablet No. 321 of Strassmaier's *Inschriften von Cyrus* the duplicate copy gives eight variants;

Ptolemaic period and so must have been in use for about four thousand years. See Budge: *The Literature of the Egyptians*, p. 50.

[113] Three of these duplicates may be seen in Strassmaier's *Inschriften von Cyrus* and 14 in his *Inschriften von Nebuchadonosor*. See also VASD. The five quadrililingual inscriptions of Darius on steles placed along the Suez canal were duplicates, as were also his Egyptian inscriptions at El Khergeh. (See TSBA. V. 293 and *Recueil de Travaux* VII. 1, IX. 131, XI. 160.)

[114] This appears most clearly and frequently from the various originals of the Behistun inscriptions as they appear in the four recensions or editions, of which we possess one each in whole or in part in the Persian, Susian, Babylonian, and Aramaic. These differences will be discussed more fully when we come to consider the book of Chronicles. Here attention is called merely to the fact that the Babylonian copy of the Aramaic varies frequently from its original in the enumerations, and that the Babylonian and Aramaic recensions are much shorter than the Persian and Susian.

[115] See plates in W. Max Müller's *Die Palästinaliste Thothmes III.*

one supplies an erosion, one an omission, one an explanation, three are corrections, and two fuller writings. One of the best exhibitions of duplicates and triplicates will be found in Dennefeld's *Geburts-Omina.* An intelligent study of this masterly work might well be made a propædeutic to the study of textual criticism, illustrating as it does from numerous contemporary documents all kinds of copyists' mistakes due to sight and sound.

7. Hundreds of bilingual inscriptions containing the original Sumerian with its Assyrian translations, some made in the time of Hammurabi and some in the time of Ashurbanipal, as well as the four recensions of the Behistun inscriptions, known to us, show that the kinds of variations that we find between the Hebrew text and its versions are to be found in them. As these variations do not impair the general veracity of these extra-biblical documents nor militate against their antiquity or genuineness, so neither do the variations of the Hebrew text destroy their general and essential trustworthiness.[116]

---

[116] More than 2,000 interlinear texts are mentioned in Bezold's *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Texts in the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum.* Good examples are published in *The Seven Tablets of Creation* by Prof. L. W. King, pp. 130-139, 180. On page 217 of this same work will be found an example of a work in Sumerian containing word for word explanations in Assyrian. Hundreds of such texts have been found in the library of Kuyunjik (see Bezold's *Catalogue,* pp. 2010, 2092-2103). One of the most interesting of these bilingual inscriptions is by *Samsuiluna,* successor of Hammurabi, of which there are

8. If the original documents of the duplicates of the Old Testament (making about one-fifth of the whole) were written in cuneiform script, most of the variations between them could be paralleled by the variations in the translations of the Assyrian from the Sumerian.[117]

III. THE AD HOMINEM ARGUMENT

But the strongest argument against the critics from the textual point of view is the childlike simplicity with which they appeal to that part of the text which happens to suit their particular theory of Old Testament history, literature or religion. After having, in order to prove this theory, cast out, without one item of evidence to support them, hundreds of words from the *prima facie* text of the documents, they proceed to point and interpret what remains with as much assurance as if they had really proven beyond all controversy that what they had arbitrarily cast out was false and with as much presumption as if

---

two copies of the Sumerian original and two copies of the Babylonian version, with slight variants in both originals and versions (see King: *The Letters of Hammurabi,* p. 198 f).

[117] E. g. the numerous synonyms in the parallel passages of Kings and Chronicles may be compared to the rendering of *DIM,* in the creation tablets, by *ba-ni, ba-na-at, ip-še-it,* and *e-pu-uš,* and *BA-RU* by *e-pu-uš,* and *ib-ta-ni.* See the *Creation of the World by Marduk* in King's *Seven Tablets of Creation, I.* 130-139. On this subject the author of this article read a paper at the International Congress of Orientalists in St. Louis in 1904. He hopes to be able to publish this paper at an early date.

they had actually proven that what they have retained is true. What would a court do with a plaintiff that desired to have a document admitted as evidence in support of his side of the case, after the same plaintiff had charged that the document was neither genuine, authentic, nor historical, and after the document had been amended to suit the contention of the plaintiff? Would the court not demand at least that the plaintiff should prove beyond controversy that the parts of the documents that the plaintiff desired to introduce as evidence were reliable, as claimed? And since in almost every instance of such claim the critics are unable to produce any proof—simply because no such proof exists,—is it not obvious that they must be debarred from introducing as evidence the parts that support their side, as long at least as they insist on denying the evidence of the parts that support the defense? In short, no argument can be made against that part of the text of the Old Testament which upholds the *prima facie* evidence of the documents, which will not overthrow in a much greater degree the text that the critics attempt to establish.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In view of this mass of evidence, analogy and admission, the following conclusions seem to be justified:

1. The traditional text has in its favor in the case of the most important of the documents the claim

to have been in its original form written by, or for, certain definite persons and to have been written in the places and at the times mentioned; and the possibility of their having been written as claimed is supported by the outside evidence that writing was then in vogue, that the literary forms in which the text is written were then known, that the Hebrew language was then in use, that scribes and copyists were then existent, that the contents are in harmony with what is *known* of the times when they claim to have been written.

2. The proof that the copies of the original documents have been handed down with substantial correctness for more than 2,000 years cannot be denied. That the copies in existence 2,000 years ago had been in like manner handed down from the originals is not merely possible, but, as we have shown, is rendered probable by the analogies of Babylonian documents now existing of which we have both originals and copies, thousands of years apart, and of scores of papyri which show when compared with our modern editions of the classics that only minor changes of the text have taken place in more than 2,000 years and especially by the scientific and demonstrable accuracy with which the proper spelling of the names of kings and of the numerous foreign terms embedded in the Hebrew text has been transmitted to us.[118]

[118] By substantial as used in the above statements we mean that the text of the Old Testament and of the other documents have

3. From the above given array of evidence and especially from the fact that the destructive critics themselves make use of the traditional text in support of every theory which they have broached, the conclusion is irresistible that the textus receptus must be accepted in its *prima facie* consonantal form as correct and reliable in all cases where there is no irrefragable weight of outside evidence, or at least of general analogy, against it.

4. In view of the thoroughly established fact that the vowel signs were not added to the consonantal text till about 600 A. D., and that the vowel letters were subject to change as late as the latest manuscripts, it results that all arguments based on specific vowel pointings must be abandoned, unless the pointings can be proven from outside evidence to be correct.[119]

---

been changed only in respect to those accidental matters which necessarily accompany the transmission of all texts where originals have not been preserved and which consequently exist merely in copies or copies of copies. Such changes may be called *minor* in that they do not seriously affect the doctrines of the documents nor the general impression and evident veracity of their statements as to geography, chronology, and other historical matters.

[119] Thus, Wellhausen's view in his *History of Israel*, p. 389, that *zakar* "male" was in earlier times *zakur* and that *zakur* must be substituted for *zakar* in Ex. xxxiv. 9, Deut. xv. 19, and 1 K. xi. 15 seq., and *zakar* read in all so-called later documents, is purely subjective and without any possible objective evidence in its favor. So, also, the pointing of אבד in Ecc. iii. 6 represents merely the exegesis of the Massorites and not necessarily the intention of the original writer. (LOT, 474). Objection to the

5. In view of the exactness with which the proper names of persons and places have been transmitted for 4,000 years and their general agreement in the parallel passages, the presumption is, that the names for God, also, have been rightly transmitted. This presumption lays the burden of proof upon the critics, who, in order to establish their theory, arbitrarily and without any direct evidence in their favor, throw out *Elohim* from every place where it occurs in Gen. ii. 3-iv, and *Jehovah* from many passages in other parts.[120]

Finally, the analogy of the transmission of texts as shown among the Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Persians, Greeks, and Arabs, shows that there is a presumption against the theory of the critics that the Hexateuch is the result of the work of seventeen or more authors and redactors, combining in an inexplicable and inextricable confusion, three or four parallel accounts and four, or more, recensions of

---

arguments for the late date of Deuteronomy based on the use of *nathan* and *'asa* in ii. 12, would be sufficiently met by pointing *nothen* and *'ose*.

[120] The unjustifiable procedure of the critics with regard to the names of God is further shown by the analogy of the Koran, where we find the same variety in the use of the words for Lord and God that we meet with in the Pentateuch. This statement is based on a comparative concordance of *Allaha* and *rab*, which was prepared by me and published in the PTR for 1921. It shows that some Suras use neither, some one or the other, and some both; and this in all kinds of variations that are found in the Pentateuch.

laws representing widely different periods of time and development.[121]

[121] The analogy of the great historical work of Herodotus and of great works of fiction like *Don Quixote,* or Victor Hugo's *Don Cæsar,* is convincing that duplicates such as are found in the Pentateuch are true to life. The biographies, also, of Thothmes III and Tiglath Pileser I and Alexander and Cæsar are as full of similar events as are those of Abraham and Moses. Cæsar's accounts of his two voyages to Britain and of his two bridges over the Rhine are beautiful examples of them. Alexander was always consulting his *mantis.* "Lives of great men all remind us,"

III

THE EVIDENCE

GRAMMAR

III

THE EVIDENCE: Grammar

PASSING from the text to the grammar we find that in this line of attack upon the Scriptures, the latest evidence is also against the critics.

THE ABSTRACT FORMATIONS IN *ûth, ôn* AND *ân*

In one of the standard introductions to the Old Testament[122] the assertion is made that the use of "the frequent abstract formations in *ûth, ôn* and *ân*" in the book of Ecclesiastes is among the proofs "so absolutely convincing and irrefutable" of the late date of the work, "that as Delitzsch exclaims: 'If the book of Koheleth be as old as Solomon, then there can be no history of the Hebrew language.'" Since Prof. Cornill here cites Delitzsch as his authority, let us rule Cornill out of court as giving hearsay evidence and address ourselves to what Delitzsch says.[123] He was one of the greatest Hebrew scholars of his generation, and fifty years ago his testimony on a matter concerning the history of the Hebrew language was as good as possible. But a history of the Hebrew language was in his time not possible. Gesenius, Ewald, Delitzsch, Keil, and all those brilliant scholars

[122] Cornill, *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the O. T.*, p. 449.

[123] In his *Commentary to Ecclesiastes.*

of the nineteenth century are as much behind the times to-day as expert witnesses to the history of the Hebrew language as Professor Langley would be in Aeronautics, or a surgeon of the Civil War in comparison with a professor in Johns Hopkins. For since Delitzsch wrote the above, the Tel-el-Amarna Letters, the works of Hammurabi, the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, of the Zadokite Fragments, and of the Samaria Ostraka, the Sendschirli inscriptions, the Aramaic papyri and endorsements, and thousands of Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Phenician, Aramaic, Palmyrene, Nabatean, Hebrew, and other documents throwing light on the Old Testament and its language have been discovered. These documents prove that the old-time alleged histories of the Hebrew language were largely subjective and fallacious; and that the presence of words with endings *ûth, ôn,* and *ân,* is no indication of the age in which a document was written.

Thus as to *ûth,* or *ut,* we have abundant evidence to show that it was common in every one of the four great Semitic families of languages except Arabic, where the unborrowed form is seldom found.[124]

For example, in Assyrio-Babylonian, there are

[124] Wright in his *Arabic Grammar* gives four examples of forms of words with this ending. See Vol. I, p. 166. These four and four others, *rahabut, rahamut, subrut, and tarbut,* are certainly derived from the Aramaic. In a few cases, such as *ragrabuth, salabut,* and *darbut,* no Aramaic, Hebrew, or Babylonian equivalent has been found.

three of them in the seven creation tablets,[125] six in the letters and inscriptions of Hammurabi,[126] thirteen in the Code of Hammurabi,[127] thirteen in Dennefeld's omen tablets,[128] fifteen in the Amarna letters,[129] eighteen to twenty in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser I,[130] two in the incantations published by Thompson,[131] and ten in the astrological tablets of the same editor.[132] These inscriptions were written from 2000 B. C. to about 625 B. C.

In the pre-Christian Aramaic we have five words with this ending in the Sendschirli inscriptions from north Syria of about the year 725.[133] The Aramaic portions of Daniel and Ezra each have four and the Sachau Papyri four or five.

In the Old Testament we find from 41 to 55 words of this form.[134] These forms are found in every one of the twenty-four books of the Hebrew canon except the Song of Songs, Ruth and Lamentations. Unfortunately for the argument that the ending denotes lateness, nine of these words occur in Isaiah, eighteen

[125] King, *The Seven Tablets of Creation,* pp. 252, 254, 262.
[126] King, *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi,* 259-296.
[127] R. F. Harper, *The Code of Hammurabi,* 147-191.
[128] *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geburts-Omina,* 220-232.
[129] Winckler, *Tel-el-Amarna Letters,* 1-34.
[130] Lotz, *Die Inschrift Tiglath-pileser's,* I, pp. 204-218.
[131] *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia,* II, 165-179.
[132] *The Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon,* II, 113-152.
[133] מלכו, כברו, זכרו, אלהו, אברו.
[134] Fifty-five, if we count the forms in *ûth* from verbs whose third radical was *waw* or *yodh.*

in Jeremiah, seven in Proverbs, seven in Samuel-Kings, one in Hosea and one in Amos, two in Ezekiel, two in Deuteronomy, two in H and four in JE. Of the documents that some or all critics place after the captivity, Ezra has two words ending in *ûth,* Nehemiah three, Chronicles three, Haggai one, Daniel one, Job one, Psalms five, P two, Esther one, and Ecclesiastes five or six.[135] Joel, Jonah, Malachi, Ruth, the Song of Songs, Lamentations, and the parts of Zechariah, Proverbs and Isaiah, placed by the critics in post-captivity times have no words with this ending.[136]

In all the biblical documents claimed as post-exilic by the critics, the only words with this ending, not occurring in exilic or pre-exilic documents, and found in documents alleged by anyone to be from the Maccabean times are ילדות *youth* (Ps. cx. 3),[137]

---

[135] Of these words the only ones not found in the documents which the critics place before the exile are עברות (Ezra and Nehemiah), התחברות (Dan. xi. 23), חלמות (Job vi. 6), אילות (Ps. cx. 3; Ecc. xi. 9, 10), מלאכות (Ps. lxxiii. 28, and Haggai i. 3), and שחרות, סכלות, הוללות and שפלות in Ecclesiastes.

[136] The words ending in *uth* in Is. xl-lx occur in xli. 12, xlix. 19, l. 1, 3 and liv. 4. All of these passages are put by Duhm and Cheyne in the original work of Deutero-Isaiah. (LOT, p. 245.) Proverbs xxx and xxxi, according to Dr. Driver, "doubtless of post-exilic origin," have no words ending in *uth.*

[137] Cheyne puts this psalm in Maccabean times. Christ according to Matthew xx. 44, Mark xii. 36 and Luke xx. 42 and Peter according to Acts ii. 34, ascribe it to David in terms as explicit as language can employ. Matthew xxii. 44 introduces the citation from Psalm cx. 1 by saying: How then doth David in spirit call him Lord? Mark xii. 36 says: For David himself said by

התחברות *league* (Dan. xi. 23), and four words in Ecclesiastes.

Ecclesiasticus (180 B.C.) has four words in *ûth* not occurring in Biblical Hebrew[138] and the Zadokite Fragments (40 A. D.) have two.[139]

It is evident, therefore, that this ending is no proof of the date of a Hebrew document, nor in fact of a document in Babylonian, Assyrian, or Aramaic. The ending simply denotes *abstract* terms. In the account which Bar Hebræus gives of the life of Mohammed, he has but one abstract ending in the account of his active career and seven in the account of his doctrine.[140]

So in the Bible the books treating of concrete events, whether early or late, have but one or two of these words;[141] whereas those treating of more abstract ideas have more words with this ending whatever the date.[142] JE, the earliest part of the Penta-

---

the Holy Ghost. Luke xx. 42 says: David himself saith in the Book of Psalms. Lastly, in Acts ii. 34 Peter, in his great sermon on the day of Pentecost says: For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, etc. Reader, what think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? What think ye of the Holy Ghost? Was Peter filled with Him? (Acts ii. 4.) See further in my articles on the Headings of the Psalms in the PTR for 1926.

[138] תמחות, גברות, בהלות, אבלו and .

[139] עריות and עשרות.

[140] See the *Chronicon Syriacum*, Paris, 1890, pp. 97-99.

[141] Josh. two, Jud. one, 1 Sa. two, 2 Sa. two, 1 K. two, 2 K. two, 1 Ch. two, 2 Ch. three, Ezra two, Neh. three, Dan. one.

[142] Thus, Prov. has seven, Is. nine, Jer. eight, Ecc. six (Ecclus. eleven).

teuch, according to the critics, has four words ending in *ûth,*[143] whereas P, the latest part, has only two.[144]

That Hebrew nouns ending in *n (nûn),* i. e., the forms in *ôn* and *ân,* should be considered late is even less justifiable than in the case of *ûth.* For there are about 140 of such nouns in Hebrew occurring in all ages of the literature; and they are found, also, in Babylonian, Assyrian and Arabic, as well as in New Hebrew and Aramaic. Besides in many cases, as in שלחן, the nouns cannot have been derived from the Aramaic, simply because they have been found in no Aramaic dialect of any age.[145]

The Use of the Hebrew Tenses

Leaving the morphology and coming to the syntax, we find that here also the critics of the Old Testament cannot support their charges by the evidence. The charge that the *Hebrew perfect forms* of the verb employed in Ex. xv and Deut. i, show that these chapters were written after the conquest of Canaan, breaks down when we learn that Hebrew perfects are often equivalent to English future perfects, or even to an emphatic future.[146]

---

[143] עדות, כבדות, אלמנות and מלכות.

[144] עדות found also in JE. and ממלכו in Jos. xiii. 21, 27, 30, 31 a word found also in Hos. i. 4, 1 Sam. xv. 28, 2 Sam. xvi. 3, and Jer. xxvi. 1. The opinion of Delitzsch was probably founded on the numerous occurrences of this ending in the version of Onkelos, where there are sixty, or sixty-one nouns with this ending (see Brederick's *Konkordanz*).

[145] For a further discussion of these endings, see p. 147 f.

[146] Called in Hebrew grammars the perfect of certainty.

Again it is charged that the frequent use of *wau conjunctive*[146a] *with the perfect* in Ecclesiastes is a proof that the book is one of the latest in the Old Testament. The discovery of the Hebrew of Ben Sira has broken the force of this argument; for we find that in it the *wau conversive* is used with the imperfect 120 times and 33 times with the perfect as against only 5 examples of *wau conjunctive* with the perfect. Moreover, the Zadokite Fragments have *wau conversive* with the imperfect 85 times and with the perfect 35 times, as against *wau conjunctive* 16 times with the imperfect and only 3 times with the perfect.

Again the critics have failed to explain how the use of this construction in Ecclesiastes can be due to the *time* when the work was written in view of the fact that Daniel which they put at about the same time as Ecclesiastes has about 200 cases of *wau conversive* with the imperfect and 75 with the perfect, and only about 5 of *wau conjunctive* with the perfect. Again, if the use is due to the time, why is it that it is found only in Ecclesiastes and not in the so-called Maccabean psalms and the numerous other documents which the critics assert to be late? Again, how explain its presence twice in Judges v which many

[146a] The Hebrew forms Perfect and Imperfect refer to the character of the action as regards completeness and not as to time. The Hebrew conjunction *Wau* or *w*, usually with a change of accent and vocalization, has the power of changing the sense of a Perfect to that of an Imperfect, or the sense of an Imperfect to that of a Perfect.

critics consider to be the earliest document in the Old Testament; or that the perfect occurs with *wau conjunctive* in Num. xxiii, xxiv seven times, to two times with *wau conversive?* It will not do to attempt to invalidate this explicit testimony of Ben Sira, the Zadokite Fragments, Daniel, and the writings alleged by the critics themselves to be from definite periods by saying that it is impossible otherwise to bring some of the uses of Ecclesiastes within the period of some critic's definition of what were the limits of use in good Hebrew for the perfect with *wau conjunctive;* for the probability certainly is that whoever wrote Ecclesiastes knew more about those limits than any of our modern professors. Shades of Jean Paul, Carlyle, and Walt Whitman! Ye could not have written in the 19th century, for no other mortals wrote like you.

The Syntax of the Numerals

Whatever may be the explanation of the Priestly Document's use of the phrase "a hundred of" instead of "a hundred," [147] it is certainly no indication of the *age* of the document nor of an authorship different from that of J, E, D, and H.

Starting out with the thesis that "statistical data besides genealogies are a conspicuous feature" in the narrative of P,[148] the critics in order to sustain their

[147] I. e., of the use of the *construct,* (מאת) instead of the *absolute* (מאה).

[148] LOT, 127.

thesis violently and without any evidence ascribe nearly all of the passages containing the word for "hundred" to P, with the result that the word occurs according to their claims 50 times in P, and only 5 times in E, twice each in J and D and once in H. Of these 60 cases, one in J, three in E, one in D and one in P occur before *wau,* where the use of the construct state would be of course impossible. Ruling these out as having no bearing on the discussion, we have remaining 49 cases in P, two in E, and one each in D, H, and J. The example in H where the construct *me'ath* is found before *mikkem* is accounted for by the fact that the genitival relationship might have meant "your hundred" instead of "a hundred of you." The case in J (Gen. xxvi. 12) cannot indicate the age of the document, since the same phrase occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament.[149] Of the two cases assigned to E, the one in Josh. xxiv. 32 is a citation from Gen. xxxiii. 19. This verse is one of four (Gen. xxxiii. 18, 19, 20 and xxxiv. 1) which the critics, without any support from manuscripts or versions, or elsewhere, arbitrarily divide up into six different portions. The word *ḳeshîta* which occurs here and in the citation in Josh. xxiv. 32 is found nowhere else except in Job xlii. 11. In combination with the

[149] That is, followed by שערים, the phrase meaning "a hundred fold." The only analogy to this is in 2 Sa. xxiv. 3 (parallel to 2 Ch. xxi. 3) "a hundred times"; but in these passages מעמים is used.

word for hundred it occurs only in Gen. xxxiii. 19 and in the citation of it in Josh. xxiv. 32. The only instance remaining outside of P is that in Deut. xxii. 19 where it speaks of "one hundred (pieces of) silver." This is paralleled exactly only in Jud. xvi. 5.[150]

Of the forty-nine cases where the word "hundred" is used in P, 22 are in apposition or the absolute state, as in "a hundred sheep," while 27 are followed by the genitive, as in "a score of sheep." Of the former, four may be ruled out (Ex. xxvii. 9, 18, xxxviii. 9, 11) because they are followed by the preposition ב (b), one (Ex. xxvii. 11) because it is followed by an accusative of specification, one, (Num. vii. 86) because it stands at the end of the sentence, and one in Num. ii. 24 because it stands absolutely for "a hundred." Of the remaining fifteen, thirteen stand absolutely, the term for shekels having been omitted; so that only two cases are left where the common genitival construction (with מאת) might have been used. These occur in Gen. xvii. 17 and xxiii. 1, places in P where "hundred of" could possibly have been used instead of "hundred." In both of these cases it is used before the noun for year, which is remarkable, because P

[150] In Jud. xvii. 2 we have an example similar to that in Deut. xxii. 19 except that the definite article is used before the word for silver. In Neh. v. 11 the word מאת is used before the noun for silver accompanied by the definite article.

usually (17 times in all)[151] employs "hundred of." P also has "hundred of" three times before *talent,*[152] four times before the word for *thousand,*[153] twice before *day,*[153a] and once before *base.*[154]

Outside of P, hundred before the noun is found in Josh. one time, Jud. four, J one, E two, D one, 1 Sam. two, 2 Sam. four, 1 Ki. five, 2 Ki. four, Isa. two, Ezk. ten, 1 Chron. six, 2 Chron. four, Ezra two, Esth. three, i. e., twenty-four times in the literature preceding the exile, twelve in Isaiah xl-lxvi and Ezekiel, and fifteen in the post-exilic books.[155]

---

[151] Gen. v. 3, 6, 18, 25, 28, xi. 10, 25, xxi. 5, xxv. 7, 17, xxxv. 28, xlvii. 9, 28, Ex. vi. 16, 18, 20, and Num. xxxiii. 39.

[152] Ex. xxxviii. 25, 27[2] (twice with the article). As to the use of ככר we find it as early as 2 Sam. xii. 30, 1 Kings ix. 14, 28, x. 10, 14, xvi. 24, xx. 39, 2 Kings v. 5, 22, 23[2], xv. 19, xviii. 14[2], xxiii. 33[2], and as late as 1 Chron. xix. 6, xx. 2, xxii. 14[2], xxix. 4[2], 7[4], 2 Chron. iii. 8, iv. 17, viii. 18, ix. 9, 13, xxv. 6, 9, xxvii. 5, xxxvi. 3, Ezra viii. 26[2], Es. iii. 9. With מאה it is used in 1 Kings ix. 14, x. 10, 2 Kings xxiii. 33, 2 Chron. xxvii. 5, xxxvi. 3.

[153] Num. ii. 9, 16, 24, 31. Before אלף we find מאה 1 Kings xx. 29, 2 Kings iii. 4[2], 1 Chron. v. 21, xxi. 5, xxii. 14, xxix. 7, 2 Chron. xxv. 6.

[153a] Gen. vii. 24, viii. 3.

[154] Ex. xxxviii. 27.

[155] מאה is used elsewhere as follows: before רכב (2 Sam. viii. 4, 1 Chron. xviii. 4), פעמים, (2 Sam. xxiv. 3, 1 Chron. xxi. 3), אמה, (1 Kings vii. 2, Ek. xl. 19, 23, 27, 47[2], xli. 13[2], 14, 15, xlii. 8), נביאים (1 Kings xviii. 4), איש (1 Kings. xviii. 13, 2 Kings iv. 43, Jud. vii. 19, xx. 35), שנה (Isaiah lxv. 20[2]), כסף (Jud. xvi. 5, xvii. 2 [with article]), De. xxii. 19 צמיקים (1 Sam. xxv. 18, 2 Sam. xvi. 1), צאן (1 Kings v. 3), מדינה Es. i. 1, viii. 9, ix. 30), ערלות (1 Sam. xviii. 25, 2 Sam. iii. 14), שערים Gen. xxvi. 12 (J), and קשיטה Gen. xxxiii. 19, Jos. xxix. 32 (E).

"Hundred of" is used only three times in the post-exilic books.[156]

The extra-biblical evidence is as follows:

The Mesha inscription in Moabitic, which is a form of Hebrew, has the phrase, "a hundred of cattle" (נקרין מאת). The date of this inscription is the early part of the ninth century B. C. The Siloah inscription from about 700 B. C. has the phrase "a hundred of cubit."[157] Unfortunately neither construction is found in *Ben Sira,* nor in the *Zadokite Fragments.* In the Egyptian *Pyramid Texts* the numeral preceded the noun; but in the records of about 1530 to 1050 B. C. the numeral is put before the noun in the genitival construction.[158] In the *Tel-el-Amarna Letters, me-at* (= מאת) occurs twice; once in 25.10 before *eru* "copper" and once in 19.39 before *lim* "thousand."[159] We thus see that the earliest Hebrew records and the Egyptian and Babylonian documents nearest to the time of the Exodus support the prevalent use of "hundred of" as we find it in P.

But neither do the critics have support in the later Semitic documents for their theory that the use of "hundred of" before the noun indicates lateness for the document in which it occurs. In Syriac the

---

[156] Neh. v. 11, 2 Chr. xxv. 9, Es. i. 4.

[157] See Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik,* pp. 106, 114, 416, 439.

[158] Erman, *Aegypten,* 63, and *Aegyptische Grammatik,* § 142, 122-126.

[159] Winckler, *Tel-el-Amarna Letters,* pp. 48, 80.

numeral stands in apposition either before or after that which is numbered.[160] The Biblical Aramaic and the inscriptions and papyri afford no examples affecting the question.[161] The New Hebrew follows the biblical usages.[162]

From all the above testimony it is evident that there is no basis in the use of the word for "hundred" for concluding that P may not have been written by Moses.

THE EXPRESSION: X THE KING

The charge is made that the Hebrew of Daniel "resembles not the Hebrew of Ezekiel or even of Haggai or Zechariah but that of the age *subsequent to Nehemiah.*" One of the alleged proofs of the charge is that in Dan. i. 21 and viii. 1 the name of the king *precedes* the title. That this order is a proof of lateness in Daniel is affirmed in the words: "So often in post-exilic writings, the older Hebrew has nearly always the order (דוד) המלך, "the king David."[163] The following tables will give the number of times the orders "the king X" and "X the king" are used in the books written before or after 550 B. C.

---

[160] See examples in Nöldeke, *Syriac Grammar*, § 237.

[161] מאה is used three times in the *Sachau Papyrus*, but always as a noun in the sense of the Roman "century," or company of a hundred men.

[162] Siegfried u. Strack, *Neuhebräische Grammatik*, § 73.

[163] LOT, 506.

Before 550 B. C.			After 550 B. C.		
	The king X	X the king		The king X	X the king
1 Sam.	1	1	1 Chron.	4	9
2 Sam.	10	2	2 Chron.	15	9
1 Kings	29	2	Ezra	2	2
2 Kings	14	2	Neh.	0	2
Isaiah	6	0	Hag.	0	2
Jeremiah	10	2	Zech.	0	1
Ezekiel	1	0	Est.	9	0
	—	—	Dan.	0	2
Total	61	9		—	—
			Total	30	27

Since 12 of the citations from Chronicles are in parallel passages in Samuel-Kings, the 30 instances of the phrase "the king X" in the later writings may be reduced to 18; so that the proportion will be: "The king X" 61 to 18, "X the king" 9 to 27. The evidence, therefore, that the order "X the king" is often used in post-exilic writings and that the order "the king X" is "nearly always used in the older Hebrew" amounts to a mathematical demonstration. But a demonstration of what? Why, of the minute historical accuracy of Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, and of the unassailable character of the sacred scriptures. For mark you, the early writings before 550 B. C. follow the Egyptian order "the king X," [164] and the later writings follow the Babylonian and Persian order "X the

[164] See the scores of examples in my article on "The Titles of Kings in Antiquity" in the PTR for October, 1904, and January, 1905.

king."[165] In Hag i. 1, 15, Zech. vii. 1, Ezra vii. 7, viii. 1, Neh. ii. 1, v. 14, and Dan. i. 21, viii. 1, we have exact copies of the Persian and Babylonian order.

Again, it is a matter of wonder that the author of the "Literature of the Old Testament" should have used this particular testimony to prove that Daniel did not resemble Haggai and Zechariah but was "subsequent to Nehemiah"; for the books of Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra and Nehemiah all use the exact phrase which is produced as evidence that Daniel is later than they. Besides, the critics have not produced a single example from the Hebrew literature which they place in the age subsequent to Nehemiah to show that the form "X the king" was used by the Jews subsequently to Nehemiah. Neither Ben Sira nor the Zadokite Fragments have it;[166] nor does it occur in Isaiah xxiv-xxvii, Jonah, Joel, Ecclesiastes, nor in any of the psalms, nor in the book of Proverbs. Nor in this case can the critics resort to the subterfuge of asserting that Daniel is late because the passages in Ezra and Nehemiah in which the phrase occurs are insertions into the genuine works of Nehemiah; for unfortunately for them, the phrase in every

[165] See the numerous examples given in the articles just referred to. For the Persian Kings *cf.* especially my articles in the *Sachau Denkschrift* (Berlin 1912) and the PTR for January, 1917.

[166] The nearest to it is the phrase "Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon" in the Zadokite Fragments, pp. 1, 6.

case appears in the parts of Ezra and Nehemiah which they themselves admit to be genuine.[167]

Reader, if the most plausible, and probably the most scholarly, of all that school of modern critics that delight to assail the integrity of the scriptural narratives and to use so frequently the modest appellation, "all scholars are agreed," will make such palpable blunders in a matter as to which there is abundant evidence to show that the Scriptures are right, what dependence will you place on him when he steps beyond the bounds of knowledge into the dim regions of conjecture and fancy? If, when we can get abundant evidence, the documents of the Bible stand the test of genuineness and veracity, and the charges of the critics are proven false, upon what ground of common sense or law of evidence, are we to be induced to believe that these documents are false or forged when charges absolutely unsupported by evidence are made against them?

The Infinitive with the Prepositions *b* and *k*

One more charge of the critics in the sphere of syntax will be considered because it covers several

[167] Thus Ezra vii. 7, viii. 1 are in the so-called second section of Ezra embracing chapters vii-x as to which Dr. Driver says: "There is no reason to doubt" that it "is throughout either written by Ezra or based upon materials left by him" (LOT, 549). The phrase occurs in Neh. ii. 1, v. 14. Dr. Driver says: "Neh. i. 1-vii. 73[a] is an excerpt to all appearances unaltered, from the memoirs of Nehemiah" (LOT, 550).

books and because it is reiterated in LOT.[168] It is that Daniel's and the Chronicler's use of the infinitive with the prepositions *b* "in" and *k* "as" indicates a date subsequent to Nehemiah. Two specifications are made; first, that this type of sentence is rare in the earlier books, and secondly, that the earlier books place the infinitive clause later in the sentence. Two witnesses only need to be called to answer these assertions. First, Ezekiel. He wrote between 592 and 570 B. C.[169] and his prophecies were "arranged evidently by his own hands." [170] His book is the one document of the Old Testament that the critics accept in its entirety, their theories being built largely upon it. Now, in this book there are 49 instances where *b* alone is used with the infinitive in the early part of the sentence, just as in Daniel and Chronicles, let alone those where *k* is used.[171] Since Ezekiel was written before 570 B. C., thirty-five years before we claim that Daniel was written, why is the use of the phrase seven times[172] by Daniel a sign of a date subsequent to Nehemiah 440 B. C.? The second wit-

---

[168] E. g. pp. 506, 538.

[169] LOT, 278.

[170] *Id.* 296.

[171] To wit, i. 17^2, 18, 19^2, 21^3, 24, 25, iii. 18, 20, 27, v. 16, x. 16^2, 17^2, xii. 15, xv. 5, xvi. 34, xviii. 24, 26, xx. 31^2, xxi. 34, xxiii. 37, xxiv. 24, xxvi. 15, 19, 27, 33, xxviii. 25, xxix. 7, xxxii. 15, xxxiii. 8, 13, 14, 18, 19, 33, xxxviii. 14, xlii. 14, xliii. 8, xliv. 19, xlvi. 10^2, xlvii. 3, 7.

[172] To wit, viii. 8, 23, x. 9, xi. 4 and xii. 7.

ness we shall call is Ben Sira, who wrote about 180 B. C., just about sixteen years before the month of June 164 B. C., when some critics assume that Daniel was written. In the 62 pages of the Hebrew as it is found in Smend's edition (57 in Strack's) we have but six sure examples of this usage, as compared with seven in the 10 pages of the Hebrew of Daniel, and forty-nine in the 85 pages of Ezekiel. That is, Ben Sira has about 10 per cent of one example per page as against 60 for Ezekiel and 70 for Daniel.[173]

[173] These two witnesses should be sufficient to convince anyone that the charges in LOT about the infinitive with *k* and *b* are false. However, if anyone is yet unconvinced, I have made a complete concordance of all the examples of the use of the infinitive with *b* and *k* that are found in the Old Testament. There are more than 400 with *b* and 250 with *k*.

IV

THE EVIDENCE

VOCABULARY

IV

THE EVIDENCE: Vocabulary

LEAVING the region of what we call grammar, and coming into the sphere of rhetoric, we find that the critics of the Old Testament are in the habit of determining the date of documents and the sources and divisions and evolutions of literary works on the basis of diction, style, ideas, and aim. To this method no objection can justly be made, provided that we put the four items together and do not divorce them as is too often done. Besides, we must place them in the proper logical order of aim, ideas, style, and diction. For it is manifest that an author's aim or purpose in writing a given document will determine for him the ideas, reasons, and illustrations, which he uses to attain his purpose. It is no less evident that his style and diction will be influenced largely by the aim and ideas. In criticizing a literary work, therefore, the aim of the writer is to be considered first of all; then, the ideas, or reasons that he gives to reach his aim; and lastly, the method, style, and diction which he uses. When the author clearly announces his purpose as Thucydides does in his *History,* or Luke in his *Gospel,* or Milton in *Paradise Lost,* we are relieved of the labor of discovering this purpose for ourselves and are left free to discuss the method,

reasons, and illustrations by which he attempts to fulfil his purpose; and also, the style, the diction and phraseology, which he employs.

This long excursus has been deemed necessary because in the literary criticism of the Old Testament the discussion has too often become confined to one or the other of the above points, instead of considering them all together; and especially because it is frequently argued that a difference of style and diction implies a difference of authorship and date, whereas it may imply simply a difference of aim and ideas. The diction and style of some of Milton's poems and letters and of his *Christian Doctrine* are so different from those of *Paradise Lost* and the *Areopagitica,* that, if his aim is left out of consideration, we might infer a difference of authorship. Walt Whitman and Longfellow differ so much in style that we might infer a different age. In doing so, we would be following the method of the destructive literary critics of the Old Testament. For, as we shall proceed to show, they often infer a difference of authorship or age, from a difference of diction or style, without due consideration of the fact that these differences may be due to difference of aim and ideas. In confirmation of this statement, attention is called to the long list of words and phrases given in LOT [174] to show that the Pentateuch was written by many dif-

[174] Pp. 99-102, 131-135.

ferent authors and at many different times; and to the lists[175] given to show that Jonah, Daniel, and Chronicles were written at a much later date than the apparent aim of the books would imply, or the ideas demand.

Before leaving generalities and coming to particulars, it may be well to make a few remarks about the aims and ideas of a literary work. *First,* as to aim, it must be kept in mind that an author may have a general aim including his whole work and a particular aim for each part of the general work; just as in an army the purpose of the whole is to defeat the enemy and the general staff makes out a plan of campaign and coördinates all the parts of the service to this end, while each branch of the service, infantry, artillery, aeroplane, engineers, and commissary, has its particular staff and purpose. Thus, the main purpose of Milton's works was to maintain the sovereignty of God and the liberty of man; "to justify the ways of God to man," and to defend "the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely, according to conscience."

So the purpose of the Old Testament is to teach the uniqueness, sovereignty, justice and holiness of God, his gracious intention to redeem mankind, and the holiness of his people to be attained through faith and obedience, repentance, atonement, and love; and

[175] LOT, 322, 506-7, 535-540.

the aim of every part of the Old Testament is to subserve the purpose of the whole. Keeping this great purpose in view, we can see how every part of every book conduces to the purpose of the whole; and how the different ideas of the prophets and historians and poets and wise men, expressed in various styles and dictions, all illumine and concenter to the attainment of the one great end.

Secondly, let it be remembered that while the purpose of every part of a work should conduce to the purpose of the whole, it is not true that the special purpose of every part should be the same as that of every other part. *Paradise Lost* has a different purpose from the *Areopagitica; The Christian Doctrine* from *The State Papers;* the sonnets on the Waldenses and on his own blindness from those on Cromwell and on those

> That bawl for freedom in their senseless mood,
> And still revolt when truth would set them free.

So, also, in the books of Scripture, the purpose of the Psalter is to afford us a book of prayers and praises;[176] but each psalm has a special purpose of its own, and that purpose is attained by an appropriate array of ideas clothed in a suitable style and verbiage. Like the gardens of Versailles, the general plan is one, but the plans of the different beds are many and the gorgeous effect of the whole is pro-

[176] In the Mishna, the Psalter is called *tehillim,* "Praises" (comp. Psa. 72:20).

duced by the harmonious arrangement of the various flowers, the mingling and blending of the colors, the contrasts of light and shadow, the long allées, the pendant branches of the trees, the fountains and statues, the palaces of man and the atmosphere and vaulted heavens and glaring sun.

Thirdly, the ideas and reasons given to attain the end in view will be as varied as the imagination of the author can suggest. This seems so obvious that it will surprise some of our readers to know that critics actually allege against the genuineness of parts of the Bible that they contain new ideas and reveal a tone different from what we find elsewhere in the author's works. Thus: "modern critics agree generally in the opinion that this prophecy [i. e., Is. xxiv-xxvii] is not Isaiah's; and chiefly for the following reasons: 1. It lacks a suitable occasion in Isaiah's age"—a reason which means simply that the critics know of none. 2. "The literary treatment is in many respects unlike Isaiah's." 3. "There are features in the representation and contents of the prophecy which seem to spring out of a different (and later) vein of thought from Isaiah's." [177] So, also, Micah vi, vii are assigned to a different author from chs. i-v because they are said to have "a different tone and manner," and because, as Kuenen remarks, "the author does not carry on, or develop lines of thought con-

[177] LOT, 219, 220.

tained in chs. i-v.[178] Parts of Zephaniah are doubted because they are thought to express the ideas and hopes of a later age."[179] Several passages in Hosea are held to be a later addition because they are "thought to express ideas alien to Hosea's historical or theological position."[180] Now, these and all such opinions are absolutely worthless as evidence. In fact they are not evidence at all in a legal or scientific sense; for they have in their favor no reasons resulting from investigations. For the fifty-five years of Manasseh in whose reign Ewald would place Micah vi, vii we have a record of but eighteen verses. For the life and circumstances of Isaiah, we have but a few chapters in Kings. Of Hosea's life we know only what he tells us and of Zephaniah's we know nothing, except that he lived "in the days of Josiah the son of Ammon king of Judah."[181] And so for critics who deny even the additional information supplied by the book of Chronicles and the reliability of the headings to express opinions as to what the prophets may have thought or as to what the events and circumstances of their lives may have been, is simply absurd. It is not even as good as hearsay evidence. It is pure imaginings. The critic who puts such opinions forth as evidence is no better than a witness

[178] *Id.* 333.
[179] *Id.* 342.
[180] *Id.* 306.
[181] Zeph. i. 1.

who would testify that an accused was guilty because of his race, or religion, or looks. It involves, also, on his part a presumptuousness, or self-conceit, which borders on megalomania, a disease from which Cæsars and Kaisers do not alone suffer.

The reader will please pardon the indefiniteness of the above discussion. Witnesses we can cross-examine, documents we can investigate; but when a critic, or alleged expert, gives opinions based on opinions and not on reasons derived from experiments and investigation of objective facts, we can only have him ruled out of court, and request the judge to quash the indictment. Leaving, therefore, these aerial heights of speculation, in which one man is as much of an expert as another, or in his own estimation a little better, let us come down to the objective, obvious facts of earth and let us consider and test the testimony of the documents involved in the words and phrases contained in them.

WORDS ALLEGED TO BE LATE

We are prepared to maintain that a large part of the words that are produced as evidence of the late date of documents containing them cannot themselves be proved to be late. For, first, no one can maintain that because a word occurs only in a late document the word itself is therefore late;[182] for in

[182] See the discussion and proof of this statement in *"Studies in the Book of Daniel,"* p. 320f.

this case, if a late document was the only survival of a once numerous body of literature, every word in it would be late; which is absurd. Nor, secondly, can one maintain that a document is late merely because it contains words which do not occur in earlier ones, which are known to us. Every new find of Egyptian Aramaic papyri gives us words not known before except, if at all, in documents written hundreds of years later. Nor, thirdly, is a word to be considered as evidence of the lateness of a document in which it occurs simply because it occurs again in documents known to be late, such as the Hebrew parts of the Talmud. And yet, this is frequently affirmed by the critics. Thus LOT mentions about twenty of such words to prove that Daniel and Jonah are later by centuries than the times of which they treat.[183] In this Dr. Driver was simply following in the footsteps of the German scholars who preceded him. It may be considered a sufficient answer to such alleged proofs to affirm (what anyone with a Hebrew concordance can confirm for himself) that Daniel, Jonah, Joel, and the Psalter, and other documents of the Old Testament have no larger percentage of such words than those which the critics assign to an early date, and that Is. xxiv-xxvii and Psalm lxxxix, which they consider to be among the latest parts of their respective books are distinguished from most of the other

[183] LOT 322, 504-8.

parts of the Old Testament by having no such words at all. Finally, it is obvious that a kind of proof that will prove almost everything to be late, and especially the parts considered late to be early, is absurd and inadmissible as evidence in a case designed to prove that some documents are later than others because they contain words of this kind. For it is certain that if all are late, then none are early—a conclusion which would overthrow the position of all critics, radical as well as conservative; and since this conclusion is desired and maintained by none, it must be dismissed as *absurd*.

In proof, however, that such words are found in every book, and in almost every part of every book, of the Old Testament we subjoin the following tables. These tables are based on special concordances of every book and of every part of every book of the Old Testament, prepared by and now in the possession of the writer of this article. In accordance with the laws of evidence, that "witnesses must give evidence of facts," that "an expert may state general facts which are the result of scientific knowledge, and that an expert may give an account of experiments [hence, also, of investigations] performed by him for the purpose of forming his opinion," [184] it may add force and clearness to the evidence about to be presented, if an account is first given of the way in which the facts

[184] Stephen, *The Law of Evidence*, pp. 100, 103, 112.

upon which the tables are based were collected. One whole summer was spent in gathering from a Hebrew concordance all the words in the Old Testament that occur there five times or less, giving also the places where the words occur. A second summer sufficed for making from this general concordance a special concordance for each book. In the third summer, special concordances were made for J, E, D, H, and P, for each of the five books of the Psalter and for each of the psalms; for each of the parts of Proverbs, and of the alleged parts of Isaiah, Micah, Zechariah, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah; and for such parts as Gen. xiv and the poems contained in Gen. xlix, Ex. xv, Deut. xxxii, xxxiii and Judges v. Then, each of the words of this kind was sought for in the Aramaic and in the Hebrew of the post-biblical Jewish writers. The evidence of the facts collected is manifest, and we think, conclusive.

A study of these percentages should convince everyone that the presence of such words in a document is no proof of its relative lateness.[185]

---

[185] In explanation of these tables it may be said that they are prepared with special reference to the critical analysis of the O. T. Thus the Pentateuch is arranged according to the documents, J, E, D, H and P; and the Proverbs are divided into seven portions (following LOT). The first column of the tables gives for each book or part of a book the number of words occurring five times or less in the Old Testament that are found in it; and the second column the percentage of these words that are to be found in the same sense in the Hebrew of the Talmud.

	Number of words occurring in O. T. five times or less	Per-centage of these words in Talmud		Number of words occurring in O. T. five times or less	Per-centage of these words in Talmud
Psalms lxxix	3	00.0	Book IV	61	31.1
Prov. xxxi. 1-9	0	00.0	Book V	118	34.7
Isaiah xxiv-xxvii	0	00.0	Micah iii	15	33.3
Obadiah	7	14.3	Prov. x-xxii. 16	80	33.8
Isaiah xxxvi-ix	7	14.3	Proverbs xxii. 17-xxiv	30	36.7
Judges-Ruth	107	15.8	Sam.-Kings	356	37.2
Nahum	36	16.7	Habakkuk	34	38.2
Ezra i-vi	6	16.7	Joel	28	39.3
Micah ii	11	18.2	Jonah	15	40.0
Isaiah xxxiv-v	5	20.0	Hosea	65	41.5
Isaiah xiii-xiv	10	20.0	Jehovist (J)	162	44.4
Isaiah (1st pt.)	121	22.3	Zephaniah	31	45.2
Malachi	13	23.1	Amos	50	46.0
Ezekiel	335	24.9	Elohist (E)	119	48.7
Lamentation	56	25.0	Prov. xxxi. 10-31	6	50.0
Haggai	4	25.0	Holiness Code (H)	48	50.0
Ezra vii-x	8	25.0	Chronicles	144	51.5
Zechariah ii	16	25.0	Prov. xxv-xxix	52	51.9
Isaiah xl-lxvi	62	25.8	Esther	57	52.6
Proverbs i-ix	69	27.5	Priest Code (P)	192	53.1
Daniel	47	29.8	Deuteronomist (D)	154	53.2
Zecharia i	22	30.8	Proverbs xxx	15	53.5
Zecharia iii	12	30.8	Song of Songs	99	54.6
Micah i	22	31.8	Nehemiah	48	56.3
Job	374	31.0	Ecclesiastes	77	57.1
Jeremiah	278	32.1	Memoirs of Nehemiah	27	59.3
Psalms	514	33.1			
Book I	123	35.8			
Book II	135	31.1			
Book III	76	30.3			

A careful reading of this table will justify the statement made above that a "kind of proof that will prove almost everything to be late, and especially the parts considered late to be early, is absurd and inadmissible

as evidence in a case designed to prove that some documents are later than others because they contain words of this kind." This kind of evidence would simply prove almost all the documents of the Old Testament to be late. If admitted as valid, it would militate as much against the views of the radicals as it would against those of the conservatives.

Take, for example, the number of these words occurring in the alleged documents of the Pentateuch. J and E together have 281 words in about 2,170 verses (one in less than every 7 7/10 verses) and about 46 per cent of these words are found in the Talmud; D has 154 words in about 1,000 verses (or one in every 6 5/10 verses) and about 53 per cent of them in the Talmud, and PH 201 words in 2,340 verses (or one in every 8 6/10 verses) and about 52 per cent of the words in the Talmud. Surely, no unbiased judge of literature would attempt to settle the dates of documents on such slight variations as these from one word in 6 5/10 to one in 8 6/10 and from 46 to 53 per cent in the Talmud! Besides, in regard to the relative proportion in verses the order is PH, JE, D and in percentages in the Talmud JE, PH, D; but according to the Wellhausians, it should in both cases be JE, D, PH. The slight variations in both cases point to unity of authorship and likeness of date.

Take another example from Micah. Micah I-III was written, according to some critics, about 700 B. C.; IV, V about 550 B. C.; and VI, VII about

650 B. C. Yet the first part has 22 words with about 32 per cent in the Talmud; the second part 11 words with 18 per cent in the Talmud; and the third part 15 words with 33 per cent in the Talmud. The latest part has the fewest words and the smallest per cent.

In the parts of Isaiah ascribed by the critics to Isaiah there are 121 words occurring five times or under in the Old Testament of which 22.3 per cent are found also in the Talmud; whereas, in the parts ascribed to the exile or later there are 84 words of which 23.8 per cent are found in the Talmud. Chapters 24-27 have no such words, but are the latest of all according to most of the radical critics.

Chronicles has 144 of these words; but 68 occur in the parts not parallel with Kings, and 84 in the parallel parts. (The seeming discrepancy in the numbers here is because four of the words occur in both parts of Chronicles.) As there are about 950 verses in the original part and only about 700 verses in the parallel portions, it will be seen that in the original parts of Chronicles there is one of these words in about every fourteen verses and in the parallel parts in every eight.

It is incumbent in those who make use of this alleged evidence from New Hebrew words, to show, also, how Malachi, the latest of the prophets, has only 23.1 per cent of words of this kind occurring in the Talmud; whereas, Hosea has 41.5 and Amos 46, Joel 39.3 and Jonah 40. Also, while they are at it, will they please show how Chapter xxx. 1-9 of Proverbs

has none of these words, although they all place it among the post-exilic literature.

The extraordinary number of words occurring only in Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs is no indication of date but rather of authorship and subject. Solomon being the wisest man of his time and a poet, an observer of nature and of man, would like Shakespeare, Milton, and Carlyle have a vocabulary much beyond the average. Besides the subject of the Song of Songs is not treated elsewhere in the Old Testament and it is not fair to take the use of words in an idyll of bucolic love, such as ointment, washing, espousal, powder, kid, roe and locks of hair, as an indication of date. And again the author of Ecclesiastes, as a philosopher, may well have indulged in abstract terms; and as a moralist who better than Solomon may have spoken of youth, and poverty and weariness and vanity.

Of the 16 words of this kind in the Memoirs of Nehemiah, six are found in works admitted by the critics to antedate 550 B. C., one is in New Aramaic but not in New Hebrew, four or five are Babylonian, three refer to the walls and buildings of Nehemiah, and one to the genealogies. The only one left is found in Daniel also. Thus we see that the apparently alarming number and percentage of *late* words even in Nehemiah reduces itself to a matter of subject. All the words suit the time and the man, and his deeds.

The small number of these words in Ezra is one of the most noteworthy facts in evidence. Surely, a book written, as the critics allege, at about 300 B. C. (LOT 540 f.) should have had a large number of these words! But not one word is found in the two documents into which the critics divide the book. Out of the 14 words in Ezra found five times or less in the Old Testament, 7 are certainly and two probably derived from the Persian or Babylonian, one *('ashem* x. 19) is found also in E and 2 Sam., and does not occur in New Hebrew; the root of *Yesud* is used in all ages of Hebrew literature and besides the argument depends on a vowel pointing, and again, the root is used in Babylonian; one *abeduth* ix. 8, 9 may be Aramaic, but Ezra wrote about half his book in the Aramaic of the fifth century; one *ra'ad* x. 9 is found in Dan. x. 11 and Psa. civ. 12 and its derivatives in Exod. xv. 15, Isa. xxxiii. 14, Job xli. 4, and Psa. ii. 11, xlviii. 7, lv. 6; and the last *maḥalaf* may be connected with the Assyrian word meaning an instrument of wood or stone (Muss-Arnolt p. 316) or with the word meaning garment or harness *(id)*.

We conclude, therefore, that this appeal of the critics to New Hebrew as an evidence of lateness for certain documents of the Old Testament is unwarranted by the facts in evidence. Tested in the light of present-day dictionaries and concordances of the Hebrew and cognate languages, it shrinks into absurdity.

the alleged aramaisms

Exception is to be taken to the way in which the critics use the presence of Aramaisms in a document as a proof of its age; and also to their habit of assuming that words are Aramaisms, without presenting any proof in favor of their assumption. Now, an Aramaism in a Hebrew document must be defined as an Aramaic word which the writer of the Hebrew document has used to denote a thing, or to express a thought, either because there was no Hebrew word that he could equally well employ, or because he was himself strongly under Aramaic influence, or because he wanted to show off his acquaintance with foreign tongues; just as recent English writers use *hinterland* in describing the part of Africa lying back of the coast, or as Mr. Rider Haggard uses *trek* and *laager* in his novels whose scene is in South Africa; or as Carlyle uses many German words and phrases in his writings and even copies the style of Jean Paul Friedrich Richter; or as the debaters in the British Parliament used to interlard their speeches, or Montaigne and the writers in the *Spectator* their essays, with Latin. With such analogies before them, it is easy to see how the commentators of the eighteenth century fell into the habit of calling every infrequent word in the Hebrew Bible, whose root and form are common in Aramaic, by the name of Aramaism. It was simply their naïve way of camou-

flaging their ignorance with the appearance of knowledge. If they had said merely that this word which occurs only here in the Hebrew of the Old Testament is found frequently in Aramaic, they would in most cases have been exactly right. But when they inferred that because it was frequent in Aramaic and infrequent in Hebrew it was of Aramaic origin and a loan-word in Hebrew, they indulged in a *non-sequitur,* as we shall now attempt to show.

The Consonantal Changes.—In the Semitic group of languages there are three great families, which may be designated as the Hebrew, the Arabic and the Aramaic. In these great families the radical sounds, *' , ḥ, b, m, p, g, k, q, l, n* and *r* are usually written uniformly with corresponding signs, i. e., Hebrew *b* corresponds to Arabic *b,* and both to Aramaic *b,* and *ḥ (ch), w,* and *y,* correspond commonly in Hebrew and Aramaic. In preformatives and sufformatives Hebrew *h* is *'* in the others; and in sufformatives Hebrew *m* is *n.* In the other eight (or nine, counting *sin)* radical sounds, however, certain regular changes occur, and seem to differentiate the three families. These changes may be illustrated by the following table which is based upon a collection of all the roots in the Hebrew Old Testament containing one or more of these eight radicals and upon a comparison of their roots in Arabic and Aramaic. There are 721 such roots in Hebrew which have corresponding roots in both Arabic and Aramaic.

The numbers to the right show how often each correspondence is found in the roots of the Old Testament Hebrew.[186]

Hebrew	Arabic	Aramaic	Number of Roots
d	*d*	*d*	100
d	*d*	*ṭ*	1
d	*dh*	*d*	10
ṭ	*ṭ*	*ṭ*	71
ṭ	*ẓ*	*ṭ*	2
ṭ	*t*	*ṭ*	2
t	*t*	*t*	42
t	*th*	*t*	5(?)
sh	*th*	*t*	18
sh	*t*	*t*	4
sh	*ś*	*sh*	88
sh	*sh*	*sh*	5 or 6(?)
sh	*ś*	*s*	1
ś	*sh*	*s*	29
ś	*s*	*s*	5

Hebrew	Arabic	Aramaic	Number of Roots
s	*sh*	*s*	5
s	*s*	*s*	45
s	*ṣ*	*s*	7
ṣ	*ṣ*	*ṣ*	36
ṣ	*ṣ*	*ʿ*	1
ṣ	*ṣ*	*z*	1
ṣ	*z*	*ṣ*	3
ṣ	*ḍ*	*ṣ*	10
ṣ	*ḍ*	*ʿ*	11
ṣ	*ṭ*	*ṭ*	1
ṣ	*ẓ*	*ṭ*	9
z	*z*	*z*	54
z	*dh*	*d*	18
ʿ	*ʿ*	*ʿ*	110
ʿ	*ġ*	*ʿ*	26
ʿ	*ṣ, ḍ*	*ʿ*	0

These three families have obviously, according to the above table, certain laws of consonantal change resembling Grimm's law in the Indo-European languages. Thus, when a Hebrew root has the radical consonant *sh (š)* it is generally *ś* in Arabic; and in this case should be *sh* in Aramaic. Sometimes, however, the Hebrew *sh* corresponds to an Arabic *th;* and in this case the Aramaic is *t.* A *t* in Hebrew would be represented by a *t* in Arabic and by a *t* in

[186] For the Hebrew and Aramaic *s* = ס, *ʿ* = ע, *ṣ* = צ, *sh* = ש, *ś* = שׂ. For the Arabic, the English equivalents as given in Wright's *Arabic Grammar* have been used.

Aramaic. These three series of changes are all common or regular and no proof of *borrowing* can be derived from the consonants themselves where these series exist. If, however, we have *t* in Hebrew, *th* in Arabic and *t* in Aramaic, the Hebrew word would probably be derived from the Aramaic, since the Hebrew form should according to rule have *sh*. Or, if we had *sh* in Hebrew, *t* in Arabic and *t* in Aramaic, the Arabic has probably been derived from the Aramaic.

Observing, then, the exceptions to the regular changes, we find that there are four or five roots or words in the Old Testament Hebrew that may possibly have been derived from the Aramaic, to wit, *nadar,* "to vow," *athar,* "to abound," *ṭillel,* "to cover" (Neh. iii. 15), *beroth* (Cant. i. 17), and *medibath* (Lev. xxvi. 26).

1. As far as *nadar,* "to vow," is concerned, the fact that its root and its derivative noun for "vow" are found in Isaiah twice, Proverbs three times, Judges four times, Samuel seven times, eleven times in Deuteronomy, and sixty-four times elsewhere in the Old Testament Hebrew, shows that if this irregularity indicates an Aramaic origin, it indicates also that Aramaic words were taken over into Hebrew as early as the time of the composition of Proverbs, Isaiah, Deuteronomy and the sources of Judges and Samuel.

2. *Athar,* "to abound," occurs only in Proverbs

and one derivative in Jer. xxxiii. 6,[187] and Ezekiel xxxv. 13.

3. *Ṭillel* which is found only in Neh. iii. 15 is admitted to be to all appearances an Aramaism. Since, according to the critics, it is in the Memoirs of Nehemiah, it must have been used by the author as early as the fifth century B. C.[188]

4. *Beroth* for the more usual *birosh,* "fir tree," may not be an Aramaism, but a peculiarity of the Hebrew dialect of North Israel, where, to quote Dr. Driver (LOT, 449), "there is reason to suppose that the language spoken differed dialectically from that of Judah," and "approximated to the neighboring dialect of Phœnicia." [189] [190]

5. As to the *medibath,* in Lev. xxvi. 16, it is the wont of the critics to assume that it is the Hiphil par-

[187] Prov. 27:6 is in the part of Proverbs which Dr. Driver considers to have been rightly reputed to have been ancient in Hezikiah's age. (LOT, p. 407.) The 35th chapter of Ezekiel is put by Dr. Driver at about 586 B. C. (LOT, 291, 262), [and the 33d of Jeremiah in 587 B. C. (LOT, 262)].

[188] LOT, 542, 552.

[189] The best discussions of the characteristics of the different Semitic families will be found in Wright's *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages;* Zimmern, *Vergleichende Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen;* Brockelmann, *Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen;* and Driver, in an appendix to his work *On the Tenses in Hebrew.*

[190] Besides, it is possible there may have been two words of similar but different meaning in Hebrew, just as in the Babylonian *burašu* and *berutu.* If we take Jensen's meaning of "selected woods" for the latter the meaning of the last clause of Cant. I. 17, would be "our water troughs are selected woods."

ticiple of a verb *dub* which occurs in Aramaic, as the equivalent of the Hebrew *zub,* "to flow." In our opinion, however, it is better to take it to be the Hiphil participle of *da'ab,* "to be weak," and for the following reasons:

(1) *Zub* is used in Lev. xx. 24, xxii. 4, both passages as well as xxvi. 16 belonging to what the critics call the Law of Holiness. The verb and its derivatives are found also in P thirty-four or more times, in Deuteronomy six times, in J in Ex. iii. 8, xiii. 5, in E in Ex. iii. 17, and in JE in Ex. xxxiii. 3. Why should the writers of H, or the various *later* redactors have used two methods of spelling?

(2) *Zub* is used of the flowing of various issues and of milk and honey, but is never employed with *soul,* nor in any but a physical sense except perhaps in Lam. iv. 9; but even there it probably refers to the flowing of the blood of the slain.

(3) None of the Aramaic versions, except possibly the Syriac, render Lev. xxvi. 16 as if they considered the participle to come from a verb "to flow." [191]

(4) *De'abon* in Deut. xxviii. 65 is rendered by Onkelos and Jonathan as well as in the Samaritan and Syriac by words showing that the Hebrew scholars who made these versions considered the

---

[191] Onkelos has מפהתא, Jonathan מסייפא, the Samaritan מרביאן, the Peshitto מריבא. In this word which is of infrequent occurrence in Syriac, it is probable that the א has been changed to י. Compare Nöldeke's *Syriac Grammar,* § 33B.

Hebrew word in Deut. xxviii. 65 to have the same root as the word in Lev. xxvi. 16.[192]

(5) *Da'ab* in Jer. xxxi. 12, 25, is rendered in the Targum by *yeṣof*, "to be vexed," and a derivative in Job xli. 14 by *de'abon.*

(6) The Aramaic of the Talmud confuses the two verbs *dub* and *de'ab.*[193]

(7) The Aleph is frequently omitted in the Hebrew and Aramaic forms and manuscripts.[194]

For these reasons we feel justified in refusing to admit that the *nedibath* of Lev. xxvi. 16 can be used as proof that there is an Aramaism in H.[195] The critics are at liberty to make the most out of the presence of *ṭillel*, "to cover,"[196] in the memoirs of Nehemiah (Neh. iii. 15), which was written at a time when the Jews of Elephantine, Samaria, Jerusalem, Susa, and Ecbatana, all used the Aramaic as the language of business and correspondence. The wonder is that there should be only one sure instance of an Aramaism in the Hebrew Bible, to be proven by the variations of the consonants out of a total of 721 possibilities.[197]

---

[192] Onkelos and Jonathan have the same as Onkelos in Lev. xxvi. 15; Samaritan has דכאות or דזון, and Syriac has דויבא.

[193] Dalman, *Aram.-Neu-Heb. Wörterbuch*, p. 84.

[194] Nöldeke, *Syriac Grammar*, 32, 33, 35; Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar*, § 7 g; Siegfried, *Lehrbuch der neuheb. Sprache*, § 14; Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, pp. 44-47.

[195] ZATW. I., 177-276.

[196] Page 144.

[197] Out of the 352 words treated of in Kautzch's *Die Aramäismen im Alten Testament*, ברזת and טלל are the only ones that can be proven by the phonetic test.

The Noun Formations.—But not only in the region of consonantal changes does the attempt of the critics to prove their theories as to Aramaisms utterly break down, when a scientific investigation of the alleged evidence is made; it fails as certainly in the attempt to prove them by an appeal to the evidence of the *forms* of the words. We have already said that the noun forms ending in *n*[198] are found in all of the Semitic languages at all stages of their development and that the forms ending with *ûth* are numerous in Assyrian and Hebrew as well as in Aramaic.[199] The forms in *ûth* have already been sufficiently discussed above.[200]

The Nouns in *ôn* and *ân.*—As to the forms in *n,* the following remarks may be added to what has been said.[201] Exclusive of proper names, about one hundred and forty nouns ending in *n* are found in Biblical Hebrew.[202] Sixty-three of these are met with in the Pentateuch. Of the sixty-three, the Targum of Onkelos renders twelve by the same nouns ending

---

198 Page 110.

199 Page 106.

200 Pages 106-110.

201 Page 110.

202 The lists of Thotmes III have seventeen nouns ending in *n* out of 119 all told. The Sendscherli Inscriptions have no nouns in *n* but the Sachau papyri have scores. They are found also in the Sabaean and Minean Inscriptions and are common in Arabic and Syriac. There are 14 in the code of Hammurabi alone and 26 in the Babylonian of the Amarna Letters.

in *n,* and fifty-one by other nouns, most of them not ending in *n.* Onkelos, however, contains sixty-three nouns ending in *n.* It will thus be seen that where the subject-matter is exactly the same, the Hebrew original and the Aramaic version have exactly the same number of words ending in *n.* Judging from this fact, it is left to our readers to determine, if they can, whether the ending *n* is more characteristic of Aramaic than of Hebrew.

Again, in the case of the twelve words out of the sixty-three where they agree, is it more likely that the original Hebrew borrowed from, or was influenced by the Aramaic version, or *vice versa,* especially in view of the fact that according to the critics themselves, the version was not written for from 500 to 1,000 years after the original?

As might be inferred from the example of the usage of words with the ending *n* in the Pentateuch, it will be found that in the best specimens of Aramaic literature the number of nouns with this ending varies with the kind of literature. Thus in *Joshua the Stylite,* we find that in the first four chapters, where the dedication occurs, there are nineteen words of this kind; whereas in certain chapters of the purely narrative parts, such as xix, lxiv and lxv, no word with this ending is found, and even long chapters like xxi and xxii have but one each, and xxiii and lxvi but three each. In Bar Hebræus, also, we

find but two nouns of this kind in the narrative of the crusaders' first conquest of Jerusalem, one of them a word similar to one found in the Hebrew glosses of the Tel-el-Amarna Letters.[203]

Notwithstanding these general considerations and this common use of nouns with the ending *n* in Hebrew documents, the critics are wont to argue that certain parts of the Old Testament are late because they contain nouns of this kind. The most glaring example of the argument is that the presence of a number of such words in Ecclesiastes is due to Aramaic influence, the assumptions being made that many of the words in Ecclesiastes with this ending are Aramaisms, and that the mere use of Armaisms indicates a late date. In answer to these assumptions three statements of fact and evidence may be made.

1. In general, it may be said that the number of different words of this kind in Ecclesiastes is small compared with what we find in Aramaic documents of a like character. For in twelve chapters, or ten pages, of Ecclesiastes, there are but seventeen words all told of this class, whereas in the first four pages of *Joshua the Stylite* there are nineteen. Yet in the ten pages of *Joshua the Stylite* from 63 to 73 inclusive, there are but twelve as against thirty-four in the first ten pages, showing that the number of

[203] I. e., אחרון. *Cp. aḫruna* in the letter of Biridiya to the King of Egypt (Winckler, 196, line 10).

such words varies in Aramaic as well as in Hebrew in accordance with the subject treated of. It seems clear that the relatively large number of these words in *n* in Ecclesiastes as compared with other Old Testament books is due to the character of the subject-matter rather than to the lateness of the time of composition. Further, it is a noteworthy fact, not mentioned by the critics, that of the 140 words in the Old Testament ending in *n*, only 26 are found in Syriac. Of these 26, six are said in Brockelmann's *Lexicon* to have been derived by the Syrians from the Hebrew, and eight more are found in either Babylonian or Arabic, or both; thus reducing to twelve the number of words which could possibly be derived by the Hebrews from the Syriac. But—

2. Of the twelve words remaining, seven occur in Ecclesiastes. As to these, the following facts rule out the supposition that the Hebrew could have derived them from the Aramaic:

(1) Not one of them is found in any Aramaic document written before 200 A. D. The latest date given by any critic for Ecclesiastes is about 100 B. C.

(2) Since the Aramaic literature in which any of the words occur was written by Jews who had adopted Aramaic, it is more reasonable to suppose that the Jewish writers of Aramaic documents borrowed from their own literary and native language, than that early Hebrew writers borrowed from the

Aramaic. At least, there is no evidence that these words existed in early Aramaic.[204]

(3) The forms of *yuthron* and *husron* have an *u* in the first syllable in Aramaic and an *i* in Hebrew.

(4) *Shilton,* it is true, is found only in Ecclesiastes viii. 4, 8; but its root occurs in Babylonian as well as in Hebrew and Arabic, and the form occurs in Arabic as well as Syriac.

(5) *Ḳinyân* is found in Onkelos and Syriac; but in Hebrew it occurs in Prov. iv. 7 in a passage which the critics put among the earliest parts of the Old Testament. Besides, to call it late in the Hebrew language, we would have to prove that Gen. xxxi. 18, xxxiv. 23, xxxvi. 6, Lev. xxii. 11, Jos. xiv. 4 and Ezek. xxxviii. 12, 13, where it occurs also, are late.

(6) *Raʿyôn* is found only in Eccles. i. 17, ii. 22, iv. 16, but it is singular that, if it meant the same here as in Aramaic, the Syriac version should render it by *ṣibyan* in ii. 22 and by *ṭurofo* in i. 17 and iv. 16 and the Aramaic Targum in all these cases by *tebiruth.*

The corresponding word in Syriac is rendered by Brockelmann by *cogitatio, fictio, consilium* and *voluntas;* in Dalman by *Gesinnung, Gedanke.* Must the writer of Ecclesiastes have borrowed the Aramaic

[204] This Jewish Aramaic literature to which the critics appeal was written from 200 to 700 A. D. Of course, these words may have existed in Aramaic a thousand or more years before they were written in any document we now possess; but in like manner, they may have existed in Hebrew 1,000 years before they were written in any document now known.

form and have given it a different meaning? Why not rather suppose that he found the word already in Hebrew, formed regularly from the good old Hebrew root *ra'a,* as *pidyon* from *pada* and *ga'yon* from *ga'a?*

(7) Finally *kišrôn* is the worst specimen of evidence of all. To be sure, it happens that in the Hebrew of the Old Testament it is used in Ecclesiastes alone; but how it can be said to have been derived by the writer from the Aramaic passes belief when we observe that the word has not been found in any Aramaic document of any dialect or time.[204a]

3. Even if it could be proven that certain words in a Hebrew document had been derived from the Aramaic, it would not determine the date of the Hebrew document; because the latest evidence from the extra-biblical inscriptions, as well as the Old Testament itself, goes to show that the Hebrews and Arameans were closely associated from a time long precedent to that at which the critics claim that the oldest documents of the Old Testament were written.[205]

[204a] On the other hand, the form *ku-šir* in the sense of "success" is found in Babylonian of the time of Abraham. (See Dennefeld's *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geburts-Omina.)* The root is not found in Aramaic till 137 A. D.

[205] Thus the *Aḥlamu,* a tribe of Arameans, are mentioned in one of the Amarna Letters (Winckler, 291, lines 6, 8); and Naharina, the Aramaic form of Naharayim, occurs in Egyptian as early as the time of Thotmes I. (Breasted, *Ancient Records,* II, 81.) See my article in the April number of the PTR for 1925.

THE MEANINGS OF WORDS

Lastly, when we leave the region of sounds and forms and enter that of sense and meaning, we find that here also the critics make assertions with regard to the derivation and borrowing of words which are demonstrably contrary to the facts. In cases such as טלל *(ṭillel,* "covered," Neh. iii. 15), it is easy to show the probability that the word is an Aramaism, because the proper letter for the first radical should have been *ṣ,* not *ṭ,* if the word had the probable original Hebrew form of writing and sound. In cases such as *hithḥabberuth* (Dan. xi. 23), it is easy to suppose an Aramaism, because the form is common in Aramaic and is met with but once besides in the Old Testament Hebrew. But when we come to words which have no indication *(indicia)* either in sound or form that they are of Aramaic origin, we often find the critics simply asserting as a fact that a word is an Aramaism without producing any proofs whatever to support the assertion.

Thus DeWette-Schrader[206] speak of *pashar, baṭal, tanaf* and *kotel* as Aramaic, and a proof of the late date of Ecclesiastes and of the Song of Songs. They give no proof except the fact that the words are found in Aramaic. The evidence from this fact is nullified by the discovery that all four words are found in Babylonian, and all but the last one, in

[206] *Einleitung,* pp. 543, 561.

Arabic with exactly the same sound, form, and meaning which is characteristic of the Hebrew.

Again, Dr. Driver in LOT mentions among the words in Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs "having usually affinities with the Aramaic nine that are" [207] found with appropriate sound, form and meaning, in the Babylonian language and in documents long antedating the time of the captivity. Of these words, *sha* is not found in any pure Aramaic dialect, is the ordinary relative in Babylonian from the earliest to the latest documents, and is found in all periods of Hebrew literature;[208] and *'umman* (master-workman) and *shalheveth* (flame) are so distinctively Babylonian in form and sense that there can be no doubt that Aramaic as well as Hebrew derived them from the Babylonian.

Cornill (*Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament,* 449) calls (1) *badal,* (2) *'bâd,* (3) *zemân,* (4) *pithgâm,* (5) *ra'yôn,* (6) *gumâts,* and (7) *takkîf* purely Aramaic. The first of these is found in Babylonian and Arabic as well as in Hebrew and Aramaic. The classing of the second as an Aramaism depends upon the pointing. The Targum gave it the pointing of the word for slave or workman and renders by "their scholars who were subject to them." The third is found in Arabic in the verb forms as well as in many derivatives; whereas in

[207] *Op. cit.,* pp. 440, 474.

[208] See my article on הזהיר in PTR for 1919.

Syriac there is no verb form and the nouns all have *b* instead of *m*. The fourth word is probably Hittite or Armenian; the fifth is not found in any Aramaic dialect in the sense it has in Ecclesiastes; and the sixth is not found in Syriac till the third century and then only in the Bible and in commentaries on the Bible. Besides, the usual form in Syriac has an *Ayin* for the third radical, showing that the form with *Tsadhe* was most probably derived from the Hebrew.

We leave it to our readers to decide whether it is more probable that the Hebrews derived these, and all such, words from the Babylonian (if indeed most of them are not primitive Semitic) documents, which at least antedated the Hebrew documents, rather than from the Aramaic, whose earliest use of the words so far as shown in writing, is in general from 300 to 1,000 years later than the time of the compilation of the Hebrew, even if with the critics we put Ecclesiastes as late as 100 B. C.

Finally, the late Prof. Kautzsch in his work on *Aramaisms in the Old Testament (Die Aramaismen im Alten Testamente)* gives about 350 words as being certainly, probably, or possibly, of Aramaic origin. Of these about 150 do not occur in form and sense in any Aramaic dialect. Two hundred and thirty-five are found in Hebrew or Hebrew and New Hebrew alone or in Hebrew and Babylonian, Arabic, or Ethiopic, or Phenician. Only about 115 of the words, or roots, are found in Aramaic documents

antedating the second century A. D., and only about 40 of these are not found in Babylonian, Arabic, Phenician, or Ethiopic. Of the 350 words, the roots of about 25 are found in Phenician or Punic; of 17, in Sabean and Minean; of 50, in Ethiopic; of 150, in Arabic; and of more than 100 in Babylonian.

Of these 350 words 50 are found in the Pentateuch. If these 50 were really Aramaic words, we would expect the Aramaic versions to render them by some form from the same root. We find, however, that the Samaritan renders only 23 in this manner; the version of Onkelos 24; the Pseudo-Jonathan 14, and the Syriac Peshitto 17. That is, the translators of the Pentateuch from Hebrew into Aramaic, all of them excellent scholars, as their work shows, and all of them thoroughly acquainted with Hebrew and Aramaic, thought it necessary to translate from one-half to two-thirds of these 50 words in order to render them intelligible to the Aramaean readers! Besides the majority of the words rendered by words from the same root, are found to have the same roots in Arabic, Ethiopic, or Babylonian. For example, the roots of sixteen out of twenty-four such words in Onkelos are found also in Babylonian or Arabic.

Finally, of these 350 words, only 115 are found in Biblical Aramaic, together with the Aramaic inscriptions and papyri preceding 200 B. C.; and 80 of these 115 are found in root or form in Arabic or Babylonian. Of the remaining 235 words not more

than 15 occur in any or all Aramaic documents antedating the time when the Peshitto Syriac version was made; that is, about 200 A. D.

In conclusion, then, it is evident that of these 350 words, about 100 have not been found in any Aramaic document, and that, according to the dates affixed to the O. T. documents by the critics themselves, about 120 more of these words were used by the writers of the Old Testament from 350 to 700 years earlier than they have been found in any Aramaic document. We can easily understand how these translators of the Bible into the Aramaic dialects should have borrowed many words from the original, and how the Jews who wrote in Aramaic should have employed many Hebraisms; but how writers can have borrowed words from documents written 700 years after they were dead is a mystery for the critics to explain. If it is said that these Aramaic words may have existed and have been known to the Hebrew critics 700 years before they were written in Aramaic documents, we reply: so also can they have existed and have been known in Hebrew 700 years before they are found in Hebrew documents. Let us stick to the written documents. Assertion and conjecture are not evidence. And yet, it is on such alleged evidence as these so-called Aramaisms that the critics conclude that about 1,500 verses of the Old Testament, and often the sections and books in which they occur, must have been written after the exile, or even after the

time of Nehemiah. To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them.[208a]

The Use of Synonyms

We object to the assumption that the prevalent use of one synonym in one document and of another synonym in a second document is proof of difference of age or authorship.[209] A fine discrimination in the use of synonymous expressions is a proof rather of the superior rhetorical ability of one author than of an indiscriminate use of words by many authors. Yet the critics indulge themselves in elaborate collections of synonymous terms which they put forth as indisputable proof of difference of author and date.

Thus, *pada,* "to redeem," is said to be used by D in the same sense as *ga'al* by P. A closer study reveals the fact that in Babylonian, Arabic, and Aramaic, as well as in Hebrew, the first of these verbs is used primarily and predominantly for the redemption from captivity; whereas *ga'al* is a verb found only in Hebrew and used specifically to describe certain duties of the next of kin, such as vengeance for blood, marrying the widow of a deceased kinsman, and others, including also the redemption from captivity.

[208a] For a detailed treatment of Aramaisms in the Old Testament, see my articles in the *Presbyterian Review* for 1925.

[209] See my note on מנה (mana) and its synonyms in PTR for 1918.

In some passages of the Pentateuch, as well as of the prophets, it is difficult for *us* to see why one should be used rather than the other; but generally it may be said that the next of kin *(gô'ēl)* performs his duty toward his captive kinsman *(gā'ûl)* by buying him back (פדה), i. e., paying the ransom money. Either verb might rightly be used, therefore, in speaking of the redemption. Any author of any age might have used either verb to denote this act of redeeming on the part of a kinsman, and there is no passage in the Pentateuch where either verb is used which could not as well have been written by the same author as all the other passages containing either.

DISTINCTIONS IN USAGE

We object to a word being considered as an evidence of age when no other word in the language could have expressed the exact meaning as well as the one employed. Thus *gîl* in Dan. i. 10, is said to indicate a date in the second century B. C. rather than the sixth. The only reason for this given in LOT[210] is that in the use of this word the Hebrew of Daniel resembles the Hebrew "of the age *subsequent to Nehemiah,*" since it is used "also in Samaritan and Talmudic." We have already shown[211] that such resemblances for *hapax legomena* are found in every book of the Old Testament and not specifically in

[210] Page 506, 10.
[211] Page 131 f.

Daniel. It might be asked, also, why if it characterizes the age subsequent to Nehemiah, it is not found in Ecclesiasticus or the Zadokite Fragments. Or, if we press the argument, why then does it not prove that Daniel was written after the Zadokite Fragments, i. e., after 40 A. D.? Of course, the critics will say that the writers of these books had no occasion to use the word, since they do not refer to any such band, or company of men as Daniel and his three companions. And they are right; but the same is true of all the writers of the other Old Testament books, and Daniel shows his linguistic ability in that to express a new idea, or a conception different from that employed by others, he has made use of a different word. For, we would like to ask the critics, what word is there in Hebrew that would so well convey the exact thought represented by *gîl?* The words for generation[212] would hardly suit, nor would the ordinary words for band or company.[213] For the author means to say just what he does say, that Daniel and his companions were brought up, or reared, with other youths of about the same age. Of course, they were of the same generation and perhaps of the same race and company and station in society, but the par-

---

[212] תולדה and דור.

[213] חבל in 1 Sam. x. 5, 10, used of the company of prophets and in Ps. cxix. 61 of the wicked; or חבר as used in Hos. vi. 9 of the priests, are the best possible words. But these could not be translated by *age*, in such phrases as "about your age."

ticular statement made in Dan. i. 10 is that they were of about the same number of years of age. How else could the critics have said it better and more clearly? And how do we know that Moses, or David, or Isaiah, or Jeremiah, would not have used the same word, if *they* had wanted to express the same idea? Let the critics tell us how *they* would have done it, if they had been writing in the sixth century B. C. Let them cease to cite the traditional authority *(sic!)* of DeWette-Schrader and other scholars and think out some way of bettering this "rotten" *(verderbte)* Hebrew.[214] As an interested onlooker, we expect to see them confounded in all their attempts to beat Daniel at writing Hebrew. In fact, with all his difficult passages, we think him excellent—much better in fact than anything in the Hebrew line of literature that either his German or English detractors can themselves produce.

OTHER PECULIARITIES OF STYLE OR DICTION

We object to considering a word or phrase recurrent in one document as being in itself a proof of a particular age. Kipling's "that is another story" might have been written any time in the last five hundred years. So "I am Jehovah" might have been written at any time from Abraham to Christ.

---

[214] *Der verderbte Charakter des Idiomes in den hebraisch concipirten Abschnitten* is cited by De Wette-Schrader (*Einleitung*, p. 499) in favor of the late date of Daniel.

Nor is the fact that certain words occur in one document and certain other words in another to be taken as constituting proof of different authors for the two documents. Milton uses scores of words in his *Areopagitica* which are never found in any of his poetical works. He employs hundreds of words and phrases in some of his works that are not found in others of his works.[215] Why may Moses and Isaiah not have done the same? The fact of the variations of words and idioms is one thing, the reasons for the variations are another thing. That certain words for "create" and "make" are used in Gen. i and certain others in Gen. ii is a fact; but if this proves different authors, how about the thirty-two words which are found in the Koran to express the same idea? Are we to conjure up a dozen or more authors of the Koran to account for the variations in the vocabulary? We promise as Christians to nurture or train our children; but we speak of rearing, raising, educating, teaching, or bringing them up. In some churches, they "take up a collection"; in others, they "make an offering." Differences of word and idiom are not so

---

[215] Thus on pages 94-97 of *The Areopagitica* (Bohn's edition of the Prose Works of Milton, Vol. II) he uses 73 words not found at all in his poetical works. There are 584 *hapax legomena* in Milton's poetical works beginning with the letter *a* alone. See the *Lexicon to the English Poetical Works of John Milton*, by Laura E. Lockwood, Ph.D., a work much to be commended for study to those who would engage in the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament.

much indications of difference in age and author as they are of difference in subject-matter, fecundity of conception, and fertility of expression.[216] One great writer will use a larger vocabulary and more idioms than twenty men with small knowledge and less language.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we claim that the assaults upon the integrity and trustworthiness of the Old Testament along the line of language have utterly failed. The critics have not succeeded in a single line of attack in showing that the diction and style of any part of the Old Testament are not in harmony with the ideas and aims of writers who lived at, or near, the time when the events occurred that are recorded in the various documents. In every case, it seems clear that the language suits the age at which the *prima facie* evidence of the document indicates that it was written. We boldly challenge these Goliaths of ex-cathedra theories to come down into the field of ordinary concordances, dictionaries, and literature, and fight a fight to the finish on the level ground of the facts and the evidence.

[216] See my article on *The Authenticity of Jonah* in PTR for 1918.

V

THE EVIDENCE

HISTORY

V

THE EVIDENCE: History

FINALLY, let us review the framework of Old Testament history as a whole and see how it stands the tests which modern scientific research has brought to bear upon it. Can a man of scientific attainments still place any reliance upon the chronological, geographical and other historical statements of the books of the Old Testament canon? Or, has the light from Egypt and Babylon dispelled as a baseless fabric of a vision of the night that which was formerly considered to be a real structure of historic fact?

THE CHRONOLOGY

Let us look at the chronology of the Bible, beginning with the time of Abraham.

1. In the four great systems of biblical chronology prepared from the biblical statements alone, before anything definite was known in the fields of Egyptian and Babylonian archæology, Hales puts the time of Abram's leaving Haran at 2078 B. C., Jackson at 2023, Petavius at 1961, and Ussher at 1921. Since Gen. xiv places Abraham in the time of Hammurabi, it is fair to ask when the Assyriologists date the reign of the latter. Jeremias puts him at about 2000 B. C.,[217] Clay at about 2100 B. C.[218] It will thus be seen

[217] *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East*, I, 322.
[218] *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*, 130.

that the date of Abraham as deduced from the facts provided by the biblical text alone has been confirmed in a wonderful way by the evidence derived from Babylonian sources.

2. The relative date of Shishak, king of Egypt, corresponds to that of Rehoboam and is certainly to be placed somewhere in the tenth century B. C.[219]

3. The relative dates of the kings of Israel and Judah between the division of the kingdom and the fall of Samaria, as given in the Bible, correspond in general with what we find on the Assyrian monuments.

4. The relative dates of the kings of Assyria and Egypt as given on the monuments of their respective countries correspond with what we find in the Old Testament books.

5. The relative dates of the Babylonian kings Nebuchadnezzar, Evil-merodach and Belshazzar agree in biblical and monumental accounts. The order is correct in whatever sense Belshazzar may have been king.

6. The relative dates of the Cyrus of Ezra, the Darius of Haggai and Zechariah, and the Xerxes and Artaxerxes of Ezra are certainly correct; notwithstanding the difficulties in explaining the passage in Ezra iv.

It is thus apparent that the general scheme of

[219] See Jeremias, *op. cit.* II, 204 f.

chronology which underlies the history recorded in the Old Testament is abundantly justified by the evidence disclosed by the extra-biblical records of antiquity. As to the apparently conflicting statements of the present Hebrew text, it must be remembered that many of them are doubtless occasioned by the inevitable corruptions in the text, arising from the practical impossibility of transcribing numerical data with accuracy. No one knows how numbers were denoted in the original Hebrew documents. It is known that the Egyptians, Babylonians, Phenicians, Arameans, Nabateans and Palmyrenes, denoted numbers by a system of notation signs. The earliest example of the use of a letter of the alphabet in a Semitic document to denote a number is in the Egypto-Aramaic inscriptions where *b* seems to be used for *two* and *ṭ* for *nine*.[220] A double system of numerical signs and letters seems to have existed among the Syrians till the ninth century A. D.[221] Sometimes the signs were given and the number written also in full as in the Sendschirli inscriptions.[222] In the Mesha and Siloah inscriptions the numbers are written in full.[223] In the Sachau papyri they are commonly denoted by signs.

A comparison of the Aramaic recension of the Behistun inscription with the Babylonian shows

[220] Sachau, *Aramaische Papyrus u. Ostraka*, p. 276, and Sayce-Cowley *in loco*.
[221] Sachau, *id.*
[222] Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, p. 198.
[223] *Id.*

numerous variations in the numerical statements. Since these variations can hardly have been intentional, they show how easy it was to originate variations in manuscripts when there was no special purpose in being accurate. It made little difference to anyone whether the army of Darius killed or took alive a few more or less in a given battle. And certainly, these variations afford no proof of late date or of lack of genuineness or authenticity on the part of the various recensions of Darius' great inscription.

So, also, with the variations in the texts and manuscripts of the Old Testament, we must not exaggerate the importance of the difference in numerical statements, as if such difference argued in general against the veracity or genuineness of the original documents. In view of the numerous variations in the contemporaneous, or almost contemporaneous, recensions of the Behistun inscription, we should rather be astonished that the numerical statements of the Old Testament have been handed down with such marvelous comparative accuracy, as that we can reconstruct from the chronological data a framework of chronology which harmonizes so closely with that revealed by the monuments.

The Geography

The geographical statements of the Old Testament are also marvelously in harmony with the evidence presented by the documents of Egypt and Babylon.

1. Thus, the names of nations and cities mentioned in the history of Abraham are in general such as are known from the inscriptions to have been existent at the time of Hammurabi,[224] or such as may have existed in his time,[225] or whose existence in his time cannot be denied on the ground of any evidence we possess,[226] or such as may well have been substituted for older names in order to make the narration intelligible to the readers of later times.[227] This last alternative, which affords the only real or supposed difficulty with regard to the possibility of the historical character of the narrative, would be obviated if we suppose that the account of Abraham's life was originally written in cuneiform; because in that system of writing the signs might be read in different ways. For example, the name of the city of Babylon was written in Sumerian *Ka-dingir-ra-ki* or *Ḗ-ki,* or *Din-tir-ki,* or it was written in Babylonian as *maḫazu Ba-bi-li.* In all four cases the Babylonian scribes of the time of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus must have pronounced the name as *Babili,* though an ignorant reader might have spelled out the three first groups of signs as *Ka-dingir-ra-ki* or *Ḗ-ki* or *Din-tir-ki,* respectively, these being doubtless the earlier designations of the place in Sumerian, before the Semitic

[224] Such as Egypt, Elam, Larsa, Babylon and Ur.
[225] Such as Harran, Damaskus, and Beer-sheba.
[226] Such as Hebron.
[227] Such as Dan and Philistia.

conquerors appeared on the scene. So Laish may have been written with the signs *la* and *ish* in cuneiform and might be read as Laish, or after the conquest by the Danites as Dan.[228] As for *Pelishtim* (Philistines), we may compare the Sumerian *nim-ma-ki,* the equivalent in the Babylonian recension of the Behistun inscription of the Persian *uvaga* and of the Susian *haltamti* (or *hutamti*) and of the more usual Babylonian *E-lam-mat.*[229] Weissbach correctly transliterates the Sumerian signs *nim-ma* by the Babylonian word *elamtu.* So the signs rendered by *Pelishtim* in our Hebrew Bibles may originally have denoted another name. That is, the sign for the land or city often remained the same, but the denotation of the signs changed. The examples of this in the cuneiform documents are so numerous that, if it could be proven that the names Dan and Pelishtim did not exist in the time of Abraham, we would be amply justified in supposing that in the documents written in that time they were denoted by signs that could afterwards be properly read by the Hebrews in two different ways.

2. That the names of cities and nations mentioned in Gen. x suit the time of Moses better than any other time was fully discussed in an article of the present

[228] The same Chinese sign is read Seoul in Corean and Heijo in Japanese. Another sign is read Pyeng-yang in Corean and Heiko in Japanese.

[229] See Weissbach, *Die Keilenschriften der Achaemeniden,* p. 143.

writer in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for 1884. If we add to what was then written the fact of the probable double reading of the cuneiform signs in certain cases, the conclusions of that article will be corroborated and no reasonable doubt can longer be entertained that the genealogies of Genesis x harmonize with the state of geographical science in the time of Rameses II. This well-known method of double reading might explain also such difficult words as *Casluhim* and *Naphtuhim*[230]—words that have hitherto baffled the interpreters of all schools at whatever time they place the date of the composition of Genesis x.

3. The discovery of Pithom and Rameses[230a] has established forever the firm foundation of the account of the Exodus.[231]

4. The appropriate manner, both as to time and place, with which the proper names of cities and countries are used in the Old Testament defies all hostile criticism directed against the genuineness of the narratives. The marvelous way in which such countries, nations, and cities as Elam, the Hittites, the old Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Egyptians and Ethiopians, the Moabites, and the Edomites; Tyre, Sidon, Damascus, Hamath, Separad, and scores of

[230] Knight in *The Nile and the Jordan* (pp. 168, 169) identifies *Casluhim* with the *Kasluhit* of the Kom Ombo list.

[230a] See Naville: *The Store-City of Pithom and the Route of the Exodus.* Egypt. Expl. Fund, 1885 (4th Edition, 1903) and *Goshen,* 1887.

[231] See Naville, *The Store Cities of the Exodus.*

other names of places, are brought into the biblical narrative, each in its proper place and time, and generally with the very spelling as accurate as could be expected, is beyond comparison in any ancient document. In view of the fact that the biblical records have stood the test of extra-biblical evidence in scores of cases where its testimony is clear and indisputable, it is inadmissible to claim that the biblical documents are wrong, either when there is no evidence on the monuments,[232] or whenever we with our limited knowledge of the facts and circumstances cannot explain satisfactorily the location and collocation of the name.[233]

5. Another fact that must always be kept in mind in discussing the Old Testament is this: It was from the beginning according to its own testimony meant to be a book for the people and not for antiquarians and scholars merely.[234] Hence, we can well believe that as the designation of certain places changed, the text of the Bible was often changed accordingly. This would account for such possible changes as *Dan* and *Pelishtim;* just as we might and do speak of Constantinople as having been from the time of the glory of Greece the busy center of commercial activity

[232] As in the case of the Hivites, Girgashites, Magog, etc.

[233] As in the case of Tiras, Ashkenaz, Sabtah, and a few other names in Gen. x.

[234] The law was to be read to the people (Deut. xxxi. 11) and according to Neh. viii. 8 it was explained (מפרש) to them.

and of New York Bay as having been entered by Henry Hudson,[235] or of Columbus or Cabot as having discovered America (a name probably not given to the continent till 1507).[236] That we are not without warrant for this supposition is shown by the following facts:

(1) The bilingual Babylonian inscriptions are full of these twofold designations of the same place or country.

(2) The triple-inscription of Behistun and the Aramaic translation of the same often give us four different names for the same country.[237]

(3) The Elephantine of the Greeks was *ābu*[237a] in Egyptian, and *Yeb* in our Aramaic text.

(4) In the Old Testament itself two names are sometimes used for the same city or country.[238]

(5) The Jewish translators of the Old Testament did not hesitate to render the proper names of places

---

[235] Scribner's *History of the United States*, I, p. xxx.

[236] *Id.* I, 127 f.

[237] Thus the Persian gives Armenia as *Armina*, the Susian as *Harminuya*, the Babylonian as *Uraštu* and the Aramaic as אררט. The name for Babylon is given as *Babirush* in the Persian, *Ba-pi-li* in the Susian, and in the Babylonian is written in two different ways, while on other inscriptions it is written in at least four additional ways.

[237a] See the inscription from the tomb of *Her-Khuf* at Assouan. *Ābu* in Egyptian means elephant, the Greek Elephantine being simply a translation.

[238] Thus, מצרים and חם (for Egypt), Hebron and Kirjath-Arba, Salem and Jerusalem.

by terms which conveyed the proper location to the people for whose benefit the translation was made. Thus, the authors of the Greek Septuagint frequently render Philistines by *Allophuloi;* Misraim and Ham by *Ægyptos.* The Targum of Onkelos gives different terms to more than twenty names of places mentioned in the Pentateuch, besides giving translations of the names of more than twenty others.[239] The Samaritan Targum has about one hundred and twenty proper names, mostly names of places and nations, that are given differently from what we find them in the Hebrew Massoritic text.[240] The Peshitto translation, also, used all of these liberties with the proper names.[241]

From these analogies we are justified in concluding that the mere presence in documents of the Old Testament of certain geographical terms of later origin than the rest of the documents is not conclusive proof that the mass of the documents is as late as the terms so used. It may be simply an evidence of editing for

---

[239] See Brederik's *Konkordanz zum Targum Onkelos.*

[240] So, according to the concordance in my possession; some of these names are translations from Hebrew into Aramaic; some are the Greek equivalents of the Hebrew which have been taken over into the Aramaic.

[241] This is evident in a comparison of the proper names of Gen. x and xxi. Here we find Cappadocia for Caphtor, Sepharvaim for Sippar, Ain d' ebrroye for 'yye ha'barim, Rametha for Pisgah.

the sake of making the documents intelligible to the persons for whom they were designed.[242]

THE HISTORICAL DATA

As to the historic character of the Old Testament records in general there are no reasonable grounds for doubting it. For,

1. The language in which the different documents are written corresponds with the claim of the documents as to the time and place in which they were written. The first chapters of Genesis and Daniel are fullest of words derived from the Babylonian, as would be expected in records derived from Ur of the Chaldees and Babylon. The records concerning the patriarchs who are said to have lived in Egypt are the ones containing the most words of Egyptian origin. The Assyrian and Babylonian words occurring in the documents from the eighth century downwards are mostly governmental terms and are such as would naturally be borrowed from the dominating races of the time. The Indo-European terms, whether Indian, Hittite, Medo-Persian, or Greek, appear in documents which were written in the times from Solomon onward, when the commercial and military relations of the Hebrews with the peoples speaking

[242] A good example of such editing is to be found in certain changes made in the King James' version in the Tercentenary Edition of the Oxford Press, where, for example, the word "prevent" of the 1611 editions has been changed to "anticipate," "go before," etc.

the languages from which the terms are borrowed would lead us to expect the influx of the new and foreign words to express the new ideas which they connote.

As to the Aramaic loan words, not one can be proven to be present in the Pentateuch, except in Gen. xxxi. 47, where the Hebrew *Gal'eed* (Gilead) is stated to have been called by Laban *Yegar-sa'adutha,* of which compound the second word is certainly Aramaic. The existence of tribes speaking Aramaic can be proven from the monuments as far back as the Tel-el-Amarna letters.[243] The fact that there are more than one hundred explanations in Hebrew of Babylonian words in the Amarna Letters shows that Hebrew was understood at the court of the Egyptian kings, Amenophis III and IV. This confirms the biblical account of the residence of Israelites in Egypt before the time of Moses.

2. As we have seen above,[244] the names, the order, and the time of reigning of the different kings of the countries mentioned in the Old Testament harmonizes with what we find in the documents of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, and other countries.[245] A harmony is found, also, in the statements made as to the rela-

[243] See Kraeling, *Aram and Israel.*

[244] Page 72 f.

[245] See for Damaskus, the article by Professor John D. Davis in the April number of the PTR for 1919 on "Hadadezer or Ben-Hadad."

tive power of these kings and the extent of their dominions.

3. We have already shown that the language, grammar and literary forms are suitable to the respective ages in which the documents claim to have been written.

4. The civil, criminal and constitutional laws also, both in their general character and in their literary forms, are in agreement with the times and circumstances when they are said to have been enunciated, or in use.[246] As to the ceremonial and ethical laws of the Old Testament, they are distinguished from those of all ancient peoples, especially by the fact that they are monotheistic and unicentral. That the ceremonial laws cannot have been derived from the other Semites is shown by the almost absolutely different vocabulary employed to express the acts and forms of religious service.[247] The vocabulary corroborates the statements of the records by showing that the Hebrew religion was of unique origin and of internal development.

5. That the Hebrew records which the critics assign

[246] This statement is based on comparisons derived from the Code of Hammurabi and the laws of the Egyptians as gathered together in Révilloux's *Lois et Droits des Egyptiens.*

[247] See the author's articles on "Babylon and the Bible" in the *Pres. and Ref. Review* for 1902, and in *The Bible Student* for 1904. The dissimilarity in religious vocabulary which characterizes the Hebrew as compared with the Babylonian is apparent, also, as between the Hebrew on the one hand and the Phenician and various Aramaic dialects on the other.

to the post-Nehemiah period were written long before (as they purport to have been) is shown by the fact that the meanings of many of the terms in them were unknown when the earliest translations were made. Even at the time when the Septuagint was made, many meanings of Hebrew roots seem to have been unknown to them.[248] This is shown by the frequent transliterations found in that version. It seems inexplicable, also, that the different translators of the Pentateuch should have varied so much as they do in the rendition of many of the terms to denote animals, articles of clothing, drugs, implements, etc., if these parts had been written in post-captivity times, when Aramaic was spoken by many of the Jews and understood by all the educated among them.[249]

6. That some of the headings of the Psalms are not rendered in the LXX would indicate that the songs, instruments, times or circumstances to which they

[248] See my article on "Lost Meanings of Hebrew Roots," in *Pres. and Ref. Review,* for 1892.

[249] That some of the headings of the Psalms are not rendered in the LXX would indicate that the songs, instruments, times or circumstances to which they refer had passed out of the memory and tradition of the Jews. If the headings had been inserted after the Greek version was made, it is hard to see how the later Jews, who made the Targums and Talmuds, should not have understood their sense. That Psalms from the times of Moses and David may have been dated as we find them in the Bible is evident from the subscriptions of the Sumerian psalms from the time of Hammurabi. These subscriptions give at times the author, purpose, god addressed, tune, musical instruments and other notes similar to those found in the Psalter. See my articles in the PTR for 1926.

refer had passed out of the memory and tradition of the Jews. If the headings had been inserted after the Greek version was made, it is hard to see how the later Jews, who made the Targums and Talmuds, should not have understood their sense.

7. Many undesigned coincidences support the historicity of the Old Testament. One of the most remarkable of these is the mention of the horse first in the history of Joseph, coincident with the appearance of the animal in the history of Western Asia and Egypt. Another is the failure to mention the elephant. If a large part of the Old Testament was written in the Greek period, it is noteworthy that this animal, which constituted the main arm of the military service from the time of Alexander down to the time of the Romans should never be noticed even in the psalms which are alleged to be from Maccabean times. Especially is it noteworthy, when we find the elephant playing so prominent a part in the wars of the Maccabees.

8. As to the appropriateness of the proper names of persons with the times in which they are said to have lived, the following may be said:

(1) The names of persons in Genesis from Abraham to Joseph inclusive are in general such as the documents from the time of Hammurabi and from Egypt would lead us to expect. Some of them have not as yet been found outside of the Scriptures, but in every case these exceptions have their parallels in

form or sense in the documents of the pre-Mosaic age.[250]

(2) The names of persons from David to Ezra are entirely in harmony with the names to be expected and such as are found in the documents from Samaria, Moab, Assyria, and elsewhere.

(3) For the times between Joseph and David too little is known from extra-biblical documents to enable anyone to make a successful attack on the appropriateness of the names of persons mentioned in the Old Testament records.

9. Attacks upon the genuineness and authority of the history because it contains accounts of miracles will be made by those only who are unacquainted with ancient historic records. Whether what they thought to be miracles were really miracles, and wherein the miracles consisted, are proper subjects of investigation, but no one can successfully dispute that all ancient peoples believed in them and that all ancient records are full of accounts of them.[251] In fact, so much is this the case that a historic record claiming to be ancient which contained no account of supposed miracles might justly be suspected of being a forgery of later times.

10. In like manner, he who rejects a document merely because it contains what purport to be apocalypses, or predictions, ignores the spirit, beliefs and

[250] See Langdon's *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms.*
[251] See my article in the *Bible Student* for 1903.

practices of pre-Christian times.[252] Whether a document is, or contains, a prediction and what the prediction means and whether and how it was fulfilled, are all proper subjects of investigation. But all ancient history reveals clearly that the nations believed sincerely in the possibility and in the fact of the revelation of the will of the God or gods whom they worshipped. None but a deist, or an atheist, will deny their possibility. Theists must admit that they may have occurred. Christians will believe that the probability of their occurrence is involved in the mission of Jesus, the Word made flesh, through whom God in these latter days hath spoken unto us as in old times He spake through the prophets. Attacks upon Isaiah, Daniel and other books, because they abound in wonderful predictions, will have weight only with those who deny the fundamentals of Christianity. To one who believes in the Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and in the preparation of the world for His coming, the predictions of the Old Testament are but the glimmerings of rosy-fingered dawn before the full-orbed sun bursts forth as the light of a darkened world.

11. The objections made to the genuineness of certain parts of the Old Testament upon the ground that they contain ideas found in extra-biblical literature

---

[252] See my article on "Jonah" and on "What does 'the sun stood still' mean?" in the PTR for 1918.

only in documents from an age later than the supposed date of the biblical document might be taken with seriousness if they were made by an atheist or deist, but when made by one who claims to be a theist and to believe in a revelation, and when they occur in what purports to be a revelation, they seem too puerile to be even considered with patience and equanimity. What! Must Jehovah have derived His ideas of the resurrection from the Persians? Whence then did they derive them? And what care I for their ideas more than for those of Plato or other wise men of the past and present? I know nothing. They know nothing. Things that are equal to the same thing, etc. And yet, the critics deny the authorship of Is. xxiv-xxvii by Isaiah, and assert that Daniel is later than the fifth century B. C., on the ground among others, that the future resurrection is predicted in these documents on the authority of God. Oh, mortal man, canst thou bind the cords of Orion, or set a bound to the wisdom and foreknowledge of the Almighty? [253]

12. The most specious objection made to the Mosaic date and historical character of the Pentateuch is based upon the infrequent references to the laws, especially those of H and P, found in the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings; and further, upon the fact that the observances noted are often contrary to

[253] See my article on *Apocalypses* and the *Date of Daniel* in PTR for 1921.

the requirements of the law. The force of this objection is broken by the following considerations, to wit: that the purpose of the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings, the critics themselves being witnesses, was not to give us a history of the religious institutions of Israel. "The stories of the deliverance of Israel represent only certain glorious moments in the history of these centuries." [254] "The subject of the book of Samuel is the creation of a united Israel by Samuel, Saul, and David." [255] With this purpose in mind the authors generally make allusions to the law and the religious institutions and observances only in so far as they affect the history of the kings and nations whose fortunes it is the aim of the author to describe and moralize upon. The rule of conduct for the people they rightly find in the codes of E and D and in the words of the prophets. On the other hand, the book of Chronicles was a history meant to confine itself "to matters still interesting to the theocracy of Zion, keeping Jerusalem and the temple in the foreground, and developing the divine pragmatism of the history, with reference, not so much to the prophetic word as to the fixed legislation of the Pentateuch (especially the Priests' Code), so that the whole narrative might be made to teach that Israel's glory lies in the observance of the divine law and

[254] Reader! Stop here and read Job xxxviii-xli.

[255] G. F. Moore in *Enc. Bib.*, p. 2641.

ritual."[256] Keeping in mind the difference in purpose on the part of the writer of Chronicles it is easy to understand his frequent references to the laws of H and P as well as to those of E and D. Judges, Samuel, and Kings give an epitome of the history of Israel primarily from the political and moral side; Chronicles, primarily from the legal and religious side.[257] The conquest, the wars, the erection of the temple as the symbol of the unity of Israel, the division of the kingdom and the history of the two parts of it, and the final destruction of both kingdoms with the causes and manner thereof, constituted the subject-matter of the prophetic history; the priestly writer on the other hand, gives the history of the kings and of the nations only as a background to his picture of the ecclesiastical and liturgical development of Israel based upon the prescriptions of the law of Moses. The prophetical writers dwell more upon the breaches of the laws, the priestly writer more upon the observance of them. In order to maintain their assertion that the laws of H and P are not mentioned in the history, the critics must and do deny the reliability of the history recorded in Chronicles. The force of their objection, therefore, depends upon the ability of the critics to establish the unhistorical character of the material facts recorded in the works of Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles in so far as they give

[256] W. Robertson Smith and Ed. König in *Enc. Bib.*, p. 2664.
[257] W. R. Smith and S. R. Driver in *Enc. Bib.*, p. 765.

information additional to, or in apparent conflict with what we find in the older books. The precarious character of the evidences for the date of a document to be used from the use of the names and designations of God is to be seen in the collections of such names gathered from the Koran, the New Testament and the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical literature of the Jews.[258]

13. The evidence derived from recent extra-biblical studies shows that there is no sufficient ground for holding that the book of Daniel was not written at or near Babylon in the latter part of the sixth century B. C., as the *prima facie* evidence of the book itself indicates.[259]

14. A thorough study of the language of the book of Jonah shows that it was most probably written in the eighth century B. C. Since the mission of the prophet was to the people of Nineveh, there is no reason why he should have given the name of the king of Assyria. The *king* of Nineveh may have been simply the mayor of the city. There are two good reasons why we should not expect to find the repentance of the Ninevites recorded on the monuments of Assyria. First, there are very meager documents of any kind from the time when Jonah is

[258] See PTR for 1919-21.

[259] See my article on *The Aramaic of Daniel* in *Biblical and Theological Studies by the Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary* (Scribner's 1912), my *Studies in the Book of Daniel* (Putnam's 1916); and the PTR for 1917-1924.

said to have lived. Secondly, the Assyrian monarchs scarcely ever record anything prejudicial to their own dignity or glory. Lastly, the Psalm in chapter ii is not made up of excerpts from late Psalms; but on the contrary is one of the most original and unique pieces of literature in existence, both as to subject and vocabulary.[260]

15. As to the conclusion of the radical critics that the books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah are unreliable, the following may be said:

(1) It is based upon the assumption that the writers had as sources nothing but the present books of the Old Testament from Genesis to Kings inclusive, supplemented by certain post-exilic works which have long since perished. Since it is admitted by all that the earlier documents of the Old Testament, such as J, E, D, Samuel, Hosea, Amos and the sources of Kings, passed unscathed through the fire and destruction accompanying the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem, it cannot be assumed that other records also may not have been preserved. The Chronicler himself asserts that he had access to such sources, or at least to works derived from such sources. No other writer of the Old Testament cites his authorities so frequently and so explicitly. That he recasts his material in his own style and language and with remarks and comments of his own, no more

[260] See articles on Jonah in PTR for 1917.

invalidates the reliability of his facts than do similar methods in the case of Gibbon, Prescott, and Mommsen. That he inserts his own notes and comments no more throws doubt on his citation of facts than is true in the case of the books of Kings.

Against the express statements of authorities given by the Chronicler, what evidence have the critics to produce? Nothing but conjectures. Nothing but surmises and opinions based on their own ignorance and the silence of other records. Are the critics going to maintain that many works of pre-captivity times did not survive the destruction of Jerusalem and afterwards perish? How then about the sources of Kings? Are they going to maintain that all the works ever written have been cited in the books older than Chronicles, that the *Book of Jashar* and the *Book of the Wars of Jehovah* are the only ones that have disappeared? How about the three thousand proverbs of Solomon and his songs a thousand and five?[260a] How about the records of the kings of Israel and Judah as to which it is said so often in Kings that the rest of the deeds of the kings were written in them? If, as Dr. Driver says,[261] "it was not the Chronicler's intention to pervert the history," why

[260a] There are only 915 verses in our whole book of Proverbs. The men of Hezekiah extracted chapters xxv-xxix (138 verses) from these 3,000 proverbs of Solomon. What became of the others?

[261] LOT, 533.

should he have invented or perverted the sources from which he claims to get his information? The present-day critics, living just about 2,300 years after the Chronicler wrote his books, may dispute about his statements and deny his facts, and even the existence of the documents which he cites; but most sensible men without preconceived opinions will probably agree with me that the Chronicler is more likely to have been right and to have told the truth, especially about the records which he used, than any man to-day. The testimony of the Chronicler cannot be overthrown by the *opinion* of anyone now living.

(2) It is not fair to reject one or both of two apparently irreconcilable statements because *we* cannot explain them. Sometimes apparent difficulties can be removed by a change of the pointing or interpretation of the original Hebrew.[262] Sometimes the objections are based on an interpretation of the original which creates a discrepancy where none really exists.[263]

---

[262] Thus וישב in 1 Kings xii. 2 may be pointed and read as "and he returned" or as "and he dwelt." מת in 2 Kings xxiii. 30 may be rendered "dying" rather than "dead" and so be made to harmonize with 2 Chron. xxxv. 24, where it is said that Josiah died in Jerusalem.

[263] Thus, it is said that there is an inexplicable disagreement between the account of Athaliah's overthrow as given in 2 Kings xi. 4 f. and that given in 2 Chron. xxiii. 1 f. This assumed disagreement is based primarily upon the assumption that the *Kāri* (כרי) and runners of Kings could not have been Levites as Chronicles would seem to demand. Doubt, however, as to the meaning of *Kāri* is manifest, when we see that Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus* (671 b), gives four meanings as being upheld by va-

(3) One of the most serious charges made against the Chronicler is that he exaggerates in his numerical statements. Thus, he makes the army of Jeroboam I to be 800,000 and that of Abijah 400,000; Zera with 1,000,000 men meets Asa with 580,000; and Jehoshaphat has an army of 1,160,000. If, however, this is an argument against the historicity of Chronicles, it may be used also against Samuel and Kings; for the Philistines have 30,000 chariots (1 Sam. xiii. 5), David slew 40,000 horsemen of the Syrians in one battle (2 Sam. x. 18), Joab numbered 800,000 men of Israel and 500,000 of Judah (2 Sam. xxiv. 9), Solomon had 40,000 stalls of horses (1 Kings v. 6 [iv. 24]), Rehoboam had 180,000 chosen men which were warriors (1 Kings xii. 21), and the children of Israel slew 100,000 Syrians in one day (1 Kings xx. 29). And it cannot be maintained that the Chronicler exaggerated regularly the numbers as

rious scholars, to which may be added several from the versions and one or two from recent scholars. If we connect it with the Assyrian *karu* "to cut," a synonym of *karatu*, it will be a synonym of כרתי and mean "executioner" like *ṭabbaḥ* in Gen. xxxix. 1. If we connect it with the Assyrian *kararu*, a synonym of *eteru* and *šuzubu* "to surround, either for protection or capture" (Muss-Arnolt 25 b), it might well mean "body-guard." The רצי, so frequently used with כרתי, may be connected with the Assyrian *pultu, paštu* "sword." Compare Syriac *pusta* "ascia, securis." That runners might be Levites, and even priests, is shown by the fact that Ahimaaz, David's runner, was a son of Zadok the priest (2 Sam. xviii. 19 f.). Until the meaning of these terms has been fixed, we are justified merely in saying that some of the details of the account are not clear to us. This does not mean that they are not true.

given in Kings, since in the seventeen cases where the numbers differ as between the two books, the text of Kings is greater in five and that of the Chronicler in twelve.[264]

In view, then, of the fact that the prophetical history, as well as the priestly, contains these large enumerations, it seems best to maintain either that the enumerations are correct, or that they have been corrupted in the course of transmission. We are not so sure as some seem to be that they are not correct. We are not to look upon the armies of those days as composed of drilled troops like the Macedonian phalanxes, or the Roman legions, but as levies *en masse,* embracing all the people from about fourteen to twenty years of age and upward, a whole nation in arms. Every man was interested in the wars, because defeat meant death or captivity to all alike. Besides, they were fighting at their own doorsteps and for their hearths and homes. When we think of the enormous disciplined armies which single cities such as Nineveh, Damascus, Tyre, Ekron, Gaza, Sparta, and Rome, used to put into the field, we may well pause before affirming with such assurance as some do that the figures of the books of Kings and Chroni-

[264] In Sennacherib's Prism Inscription I, 34-50, there are eight numerical statements. In six of these the numbers vary in the different versions. In the Babylonian and Aramaic versions of the Behistun inscription of Darius the numbers differ in almost every case. Yet these versions are contemporaneous. See PTR for 1914.

cles are incredible. But, if some think they are incredible, let them remember that numbers, especially when denoted by a system of notation, are the hardest of all facts to transmit correctly. There is usually nothing in the context to preserve them from corruption. They may have been misread in the original sources or changed in the course of copying; but only those who have never engaged in the study of manuscripts will indict a whole document simply because some of the numerical notations are beyond the possibility of being read with certainty or accepted as original.

(4) In order to prove the untrustworthiness of the Chronicler, an attempt is made to show that his work was not written till about 300 B. C. The first proof of this is said to be found in 1 Chron. iii. The text of this passage is admitted to vary so much that commentators are not sure whether six or thirteen generations are meant. According to Dr. Driver, the Hebrew text gives six generations from Zerubbabel onward. If we place him at 520 B. C. and count twenty years to a generation, this will bring us to 400 B. C., as the date of the book. Twenty years to a generation is a good Oriental average.[265]

(5) It is an absurd argument against the historicity of the books of Chronicles, that they give information not found in the books of Samuel and

[265] See Assayuti's *History of the Califs*, where generations are often only for 16 or 18 years.

Kings. Why should the author have written the Chronicles at all, if he had had the same design and gave the same information as the authors of Samuel and Kings? It is perfectly proper and natural, also, that he should have written especially about Levites, singers and festivals; since, as the critics rightly affirm, he was looking at things from a priestly standpoint.

No one can deny that the temple was built by Solomon, and that the plans and, in large measure, the materials for the structure were prepared by David. This temple was intended for the worship of the God of Israel. This worship consisted in sacrifices, prayers and praises. The service required large numbers of priests, servants and singers; and they must have been organized, so that everything should be conducted in decency and order. The Chronicles say that David organized these services of the temple. Why deny that he did this most sensible and fitting thing?

Now, when this temple was first built, all that would be necessary would be to take over the priests and the ritual already in existence and vary them only in so far as was required to meet the new conditions of an enlarged and more dignified place of worship. The old priesthood of the temple at Shiloh and the old laws of the tabernacle with reference to sacrifices and festivals would be found sufficient; but to make the service more efficient and suitable

to the great glory of the magnificent house that had been erected for the God of Israel, certain new regulations as to the time and manner of the services were instituted by David. Whatever is not referred to as having originated with him must be presumed to have been already in existence.

Since David and Solomon built the temple, it is common sense to suppose that they organized the priests into regular orders for the orderly service of the sanctuary. These priests had already had their clothing prescribed by Moses after the analogy of the Egyptian and all other orders of priesthood the world over. He also had prescribed the kinds and times of offerings and the purpose for which they were offered. The Israelites, also, like the Egyptians and Babylonians, had for their festive occasions such regulations as are attributed to David for the observance of these festivals, so as to avoid confusion and to preserve decency in the house of God.

AN INCONSISTENT THEORY MADE TO FIT

Is it to be supposed that on these festive occasions no music was to be employed and no hymns of praise to God to be sung? Even the most savage tribes have music at their festivals and we know that the ancient Egyptians had numerous hymns to Amon and other gods, and that the Assyrians and Babylonians, and even the Sumerians before them, delighted in singing psalms of praise and penitence as a part of

their ritual of worship.[266] These hymns in all cases were accompanied by instrumental music. Some of the Sumerian, Babylonian and Egyptian hymns were current in writing for hundreds, or even thousands, of years before the time of Solomon; and some musical instruments had existed for the same length of time. Are we to suppose that the Hebrews alone among the nations of antiquity had no vocal and instrumental music in their temple services? The critics maintain that poetry is the earliest form of expression of a people's thoughts and history. Many of them assert that the song of Deborah antedates all other literary productions in the Bible. Most of them will admit that David composed the lament over Saul and Jonathan.

But they draw the line at his Psalms of praise and penitence.[267] Why? Because it suits their theory that the Psalms were prepared for use in the second temple. They hold at the same time that certain poems, like the songs of Deborah and Miriam and

[266] See the long list of hymns to Amon and Aton given in Breasted's *Egypt,* V, 133. The authors of some of these hymns are given. *Id.* Thotmes III and Merenptah, kings of Egypt, both wrote hymns. *Id.* Assurbanipal, king of Assyria, also wrote hymns. See Streck's *Assurbanipal* III, 342 f. That the ancient Sumerians at, or before, the time of Abraham sometimes gave the name of the author of a psalm may be seen in Langdon's *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms,* pp. 287, 317.

[267] See pages 229-239 of Frank's *Studien zur Babylonischen Religion;* Langdon's *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms;* Erman's *Aegypten und Aegyptisches Leben im Altertum,* II, 350-412; Wilkinson, *The Ancient Egyptians,* I, 431-500.

the blessings of Jacob and Moses, antedate by centuries the historical narratives in which they are found, but that the Psalms were all, or nearly all, composed after the captivity. What grounds have they for holding such seemingly inconsistent theories? Absolutely none that is based on any evidence, unless the wish to have it so, in order to bolster up their conception of the history of Israel's religion, be called evidence.

PSALM WRITERS WOULD NOT HAVE ABSURDLY ATTRIBUTED THEIR WORK TO PRE-CAPTIVITY AUTHORS

Of course, it is obvious that music is mentioned in the books of Kings; but it is made prominent in Chronicles, and the headings of many of the Psalms attribute them to David and in three cases to Moses or Solomon. It is hardly to be supposed that the writer of these headings would have made his work absurd by making statements that his contemporaries would have known to be untrue. Whether the headings are all trustworthy, or not, it is absurd to suppose that the writers of them would have attributed so many of the Psalms to pre-captivity authors, when their contemporaries must have known that the whole body of Psalms had arisen after the fall of the first temple, had such been actually the case. The most natural supposition would be that David either made or collected a sufficient number of Psalms to meet the

requirements of worship in the temple which Solomon was about to build.

As to the text of the headings of the Psalms, the evidence of the manuscripts and versions goes to show that they are not merely substantially the same as they were in the third century B. C., but that most of them must even then have been hoary with age. Even when the Septuagint version was made, the meanings of many of the terms used in the headings were already unknown, and the significance of many words and phrases had passed out of mind. A large proportion of the names is not to be found in later Hebrew and in no Aramaic dialect. Besides the roots of many of these words have closer analogies in Babylonian than in any other language.

All this would suggest that their origin must go back to the times of Ezra and Nehemiah or to the captivity; and that they, in whole or in part, came down from the usages and administration of Solomon's temple. There is no reason for supposing that the Psalms and their headings may not have been present intact through all the confusion and destruction of the fall of Jerusalem, inasmuch as the sources of Samuel and Kings (and the works of most of the prophets) were admittedly so present. Besides, the Hebrew manuscripts and all of the great ancient primary versions agree almost absolutely with the text of our ordinary Hebrew bibles and their English versions in attributing seventy-three of the

Psalms to David as the author or subject of the respective Psalms. The Greek edition of Swete agrees in attributing to David every one of the seventy-three. The edition of the Latin Gallican version of Harden[268] *(Psalterium juxta Hebraeos Hieronymi,* edited with introduction and *Apparatus Criticus* by J. M. Harden, D.D., LL.D., Trinity College, Dublin; London, The Macmillan Co., 1922) agrees in all but the twenty-second; where, however, E and H, two of the best manuscripts, do agree. The Syriac-Peshitto version of Walton's *Polyglot* agrees in regard to all, except the 13th, 39th and the 124th.[268a] And the Aramaic of Walton's *Polyglot* ascribes to David every one of the seventy-three, except the 122d, the 131st, and the 133d.

It will be noted that all the five texts, the Hebrew and its four great ancient versions, agree that sixty-six out of the seventy-three psalms were either writ-

[268] Temples imply both singers and songs. In 2 Sam. xxii. 1, David is said to have spoken the words of the eighteenth psalm. In 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, he is called the sweet psalmist of Israel. Critics generally admit that he wrote the lament over Saul and Jonathan. Why then may he not have written the psalms attributed to him in the headings of the psalms? And why may not he, like Watts and Cooper and Wesley and Havergal, have himself produced, or at least collected, a whole psalm book? The temple requires singers; singers require songs; David supplies songs. Chronicles and the headings of the psalms state that the Israelites had in the Psalms of David and the singers of the temple just what common sense demands that they must have had.

[268a] In the case of Psalms 55 and 62 David occurs in the headings, though he is not specifically stated to have been the author.

ten by, or for, or concerning David[268b] (the Hebrew preposition *l* may mean "by," "for," or "concerning"), and that four out of five of these agree in regard to all the seventy-three.

Finally, a striking and almost convincing testimony for the early date of most of the psalms lies in the fact that, except in a very few cases, we find no definite allusions in them to events or persons later than the time of Solomon.

Thus, common sense and universal analogy compel us to believe that an orderly worship conducted by priests in accordance with prescribed regulations and a service of song commensurate with the dignity and decency becoming the house of God must have existed among the Hebrews, certainly from the time that the first temple was constructed and probably from the time that the tabernacle was erected and the annual festivals established. Historians of royal courts, of diplomacy and war, like the author of the books of Kings, may not mention such things; but we may be sure that they existed. The temple itself proves this. Universal experience proves it. The weeping stone at the foundation of the temple, where the Jews of to-day congregate to bewail the long de-

[268b] The detailed evidence as to the headings of the Psalms has appeared in the PTR for January and July, 1926, where the secondary versions of the Septuagint—the Memphitic and the Sahidic Coptic, the Harklensian Syriac and the Syro-Palestinian, the Ethiopic, the Arabic, the Armenian, and the Latin Vulgate have also been considered.

parted glories of Mount Zion and the glorious house of Israel's God, testifies that the traditions about the sweet Psalmist of Israel were not all figments of the imagination, nor mythical creations of later times.

(6) Another proof of the lateness of the Chronicler is said to be the mention of Jaddua as High Priest in Neh. xii. 11, 22. It is assumed that this Jaddua is the same as the one mentioned by Josephus[269] as the High Priest who went out to meet Alexander when he went up to Jerusalem. Inasmuch as this expedition of Alexander is recorded by Josephus alone and said by the critics never to have occurred, and as the particular Jaddua who is said by Josephus to have met Alexander is mentioned nowhere else either by Josephus or by any other ancient writer, we fail to see the force of this argument. For, if Josephus invented the story about Alexander, he may have invented his Jaddua, too. But granting that there was a Jaddua at 336 B. C., or thereabout, we fail to see why he may not have been High Priest for seventy or even eighty years. Having had a great-grandfather who lived to be hale and hearty at 105, and a great-grandmother to be 99, and three great-uncles to be 94, 96 and 101 respectively, with about a dozen other relatives, no farther away than a great-uncle, who lived to be from 75 to 92, and all *compos mentis,* and most active in body till almost

[269] *Antiquities,* XI. viii, 4.

the end, the writer of this article can see nothing improbable in the Jaddua of Josephus having been the same as the Jaddua of Ezra.

(7) The newest weapon of proof, however, that has been forged against the historicity of the Chronicler is that which has been produced in the arsenal of Oxford by Drs. Driver and Gray. The great German critic Ewald asserted that it was both unnecessary and contrary to contemporary usage for the kings of Persia to be given the title, king of Persia, while as yet there were kings of Persia; and that consequently the Hebrew documents employing this title must have been written after kings of Persia had ceased to exist. If this were absolutely true, it would bring down to Greek times the composition of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel, since they all contain the title. It is a sufficient answer to this assertion to say that eighteen different authors in nineteen different documents from Persian times use this title altogether thirty-eight different times, and of at least six different Persian kings; that it is used of Cyrus seven years before the conquest of Babylon in 539 B. C. and of Artaxerxes III about 365 B. C.; that it is used in Persian, Susian, Babylonian, Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew; that it was used in Media, Babylonia, Asia Minor, Greece, and Palestine, and according to Herodotus in Ethiopia; and that it is used in letters, dates and other like documents of the Scriptures just as it is used in the extra-biblical docu-

ments. Further, it has been shown that it was not common for authors of the Greek period to use the title.[270]

[270] See my articles in the PTR for 1904-5 and for 1917, and in the *Sachau Denkschrift*, Berlin, 1912.

VI

THE EVIDENCE

RELIGION

VI

THE EVIDENCE: Religion

BEFORE closing this succinct review of the lines of defense of the Old Testament Scriptures, we must emphasize briefly the strongest bulwark of them all, the undeniable uniqueness and superlative clearness and importance of the religious ideas contained in them.

A study of the religious systems of the Egyptians, Babylonians, and other ancient peoples, has revealed to us a groping after God, if haply they might find him; but nowhere among all the nations is it recorded that a clear apprehension of one living and true God—the creator and preserver, the guide, the judge, the saviour, and the sanctifier of His people—was attained. Other religions are outward, concerned with words and deeds. Their sins are offenses or delinquencies, their substitutions are material equivalents, their atonements are physical purifications, their resurrection is a groundless expectation, their judgment is without mercy, their immortality consigns to darkness and dust, and a future life of joy is at best for the few and great. The Old Testament religion is essentially inward. It is the religion of the mind and heart, of love, joy, *faith,* hope, and salvation through the grace of God alone. How ac-

count for this religion? It must have come either by derivation, evolution or revelation. The prophets say it came from God. No other theory of its origin can account for its uniqueness and its results, its superiority and its influence. The prophets and their ideas are facts in evidence, which all the quibbling of the critics cannot impugn. The prophets say they had their ideas from God. If not, whence? It cannot have come by derivation; for none of the other nations had the same ideas of God, creation, sin and redemption.[271] If it came by revelation, the greatest of all miracles has happened involving all the rest. For if God spake through the prophets, His revelations of His will could not have been bound by the shackles of time and circumstance. The prophets who spake for Him spake not merely as the men of their own time, but as men of all time, as men who were spokesmen of Him who knows the end from the beginning, and has all power in heaven and on earth. The canon of the modern critical school that treats the prophets as the creatures of their time is antagonistic to this fundamental conception of the prophets' mission as it was enunciated by the prophets themselves. They say God spake *to* them and they spake *for* God. The critics say that they gave utterance to the spirit of the times (the *Zeitgeist*) and

[271] That it could not have been derived from the Babylonians, see my articles in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for 1902 and the *Bible Student* for 1904.

that they were limited by the time and place of their birth. But, if this were all the source of their information, how then did it come, that not from the oracles of Thebes and Memphis, nor from the temples of Babylon, nor from the sacred precincts of Delphi, nor from the Sibyls and augurs of Rome, but from the deserts of Midian, and from the sheepfolds of Tekoa, and from the dungeons of Zedekiah, and from the lowly cots of captives on the banks of the Chebar and the Euphrates, came forth those magic words of hope and salvation and glory for a sin-cursed world that have made the desert hearts of all who heard them to rejoice and blossom like the rose in the sunlight of God's favor, in the revivifying atmosphere of His presence? God with us! This is the key to unlock the mysterious chambers of the Old Testament.

VII

CONCLUSION

VII

Conclusion

BUT the time has come to conclude this summary of evidence for the defense in the case of the critics against the Old Testament. We hope that the evidence adduced will be sufficient to show that the general reliability of the Old Testament documents has not been impaired by recent discoveries outside the Old Testament. The literary forms are in harmony with what comparative literature would lead us to expect. The civil, criminal and constitutional laws agree with what the civilization of the ancient nations surrounding Palestine would presuppose; while the ceremonial, moral, and religious laws are differentiated from those of others by their genesis in a monotheistic belief and a divine revelation. The use of writing in the age of Moses and Abraham is admitted by all and the existence of the Hebrew language in the time of the Exodus is assured by the glosses of the Amarna letters, as well as by the proper names on the Egyptian and Babylonian monuments. The general correctness of the Hebrew text that has been transmitted to us is established beyond just grounds of controversy. The morphology, syntax, and meaning of the language of the various books conform with what the face of the documents demands. The chronological and

geographical statements are more accurate and reliable than those afforded by any other ancient documents; and the biographical and other historical narratives harmonize marvelously with the evidence afforded by extra-biblical documents.

We therefore send this volume forth with the prayer that it may strengthen the faith of those who still believe in God and in Jesus Christ His Son. We need not and do not fear the truth about the Bible. We welcome all sincere and honest study of its origin, purpose and meaning. But is it too much to ask and hope that more of those who have been appointed by the Church to teach its history and its doctrines should devote their time and energies to the defense of its great and fundamental, unique and outstanding, facts and implications, rather than to the picking of flaws in the garments of the prophets and to the punching of holes in the robe of Christ's perfection? It may not be ours to remove all the difficulties, to harmonize all the apparent inconsistencies, to explain all the mysteries, and to solve all the problems of the Old Testament; but we can show at least, that we believe that Christ and the Apostles are more likely to be right than we, that the age-long judgment of the Church with respect to the Bible may after all be right, and that our business is to defend with all lawful means the citadel of faith rather than to join the hosts of the infidel in the assaults upon its walls.

GLOSSARY

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

GLOSSARY

To make this work of greater help to the average reader not acquainted with the technical terms of Biblical criticism and philology, this glossary has been prepared in explanation of some of the more important of these terms.

Achaemenid. Achaemenes was the great-grandfather of Darius the Great, king of Persia in the days of Marathon, 522 to 486 B. C. The Persian kings of this dynasty are called Achaemenids.

Ashurbanipal. Ashurbanipal was the last great king of Assyria and reigned from 666 to 626 B. C. The best work on him is in three volumes by Streck.

Bar Hebraeus. Bar-Hebraeus, or Abu'l-Faraj Gregory, was a Jewish convert to Christianity and "one of the most learned and versatile men that Syria ever produced." (See Wright: *Syriac Literature,* 265-281.) The account of the conquest of Jerusalem will be found in the *Chronicon Syriacum* (263-266), sold by Maissoneuve, Paris.

Behistun. Behistun, the ancient Bagistana, is the name of a village on the highway between Babylonia and Ecbatana (Hamadan), the capital of Media. On the face of a rock 500 feet above the plain are inscriptions of Darius the Great in Persian, Elamitic and Babylonian. (See Eduard Meyer in Encyclopedia Brittanica, III, 656; Weissbach and Bang: *Die altpersischen Keilinschriften,* 1893; King and Thompson: *The Inscription of Darius the Great at Behistun,* 1907; and works by Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson.) An Aramaic recension of this inscription was found in Egypt and published by Edouard Sachau in his *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka,* 1911. [Reviewed

by the writer in the PTR for 1914.] It is to be found also in Cowley's *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C.*

Ben Sira. Name of the writer of the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus.

Cartouches. A cartouche is an oval or oblong figure in an Egyptian document, containing the name of a sovereign.

Consonantal Text. Only the consonants and, in some cases, the vowel letters *w* to denote ô and û and *y* to denote ê and î, were used in the Old Testament text before about A. D. 600, at which time vowel signs were added.

Dim. Sumerian word for create and make. (See Delitzsch: *Sumerisches Glossar,* p. 138.)

Elephantine. Elephantine was the name of a city on an island at the first cataract of the Nile. Its name denotes elephant in the Egyptian abu, as well as in the Greek from which the English is merely a transliteration. Opposite the island was the city of Syene or Assouan. It is about 551 miles by rail from Cairo.

Gloss. An explanatory word or phrase. In the Amarna Letters the Hebrew glosses explain the Babylonian words.

Grimm's Law. *Grimm's law* is the name for the regular interchange of certain consonants in the so-called Indo-European family of languages. See Max Müller's *Lectures on the Science of Language,* II. Lecture V, Skeat's *Principles of English Etymology,* p. 104, and Whitney's *Language and the Study of Language.*

Hammurabi. Hammurabi (or pi) "the mighty king, the king of Babylon, the king of the four quarters," as he calls himself (see King: *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi,* p. 179), seems at first to have been subject to Elam, whose king he overthrew in his thirty-first year *(id* 23).

Hapax Legomena. Words occurring once only in a document.

Hexateuch. First six books of the Bible. Writers on the first six books of the Old Testament commonly employ the letters H, P, J, E, D, to denote the five sources of these books as claimed by the critics.

P denotes the so-called priest-codex, which is supposed to have been written after the time of Ezekiel. Broadly, it embraces all of Leviticus, except chapters xvii-xxvi, nearly all of Numbers, a large part especially of the latter part of Exodus, parts of Genesis (especially the first chapter), and about a third of Joshua.

H is named from holiness *(Heiligkeit)* and gets its name from the fact that it emphasizes the laws of holiness. It is found in Leviticus xvii-xxvi. It is supposed to have been written during the captivity.

D stands for Deuteronomy, and embraces most of Deuteronomy and about a third of Joshua.

J comes from the word Jehovah, and embraces a large part of Genesis and Exodus i-xix, characterized by having the name Jehovah in it.

E comes from Elohim the Hebrew name for God, and includes the parts of the Hexateuch which contain the name Elohim for God and which do not belong to P.

JE stands for the parts in which J and E cannot be distinguished.

Hiphil. Name of a Hebrew verbal form which usually has a causative sense.

Jonathan. Name given the version of the pseudonymous author of a second Aramaic version of the books of Moses.

Joshua the Stylite. Joshua the Stylite was a Monophysite Stylite monk who lived at Edessa in the early part of the 6th century and wrote a history of the war between the Byzantine and Persian empires which

took place from 502 to 506 A. D. See Wright's *Syriac Literature*, pp. 77, 78, and his work called *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite.*

Mantis. A sort of prophet-priest of the Greeks.

Massorites (or Massoretes). Jewish scribes and learned men who edited the text of the Old Testament Scriptures.

Mesha Inscription. The Mesha inscription, also called the Moabite stone, contains an inscription by Mesha, King of Moab, and was found by a missionary named Klein among the ruins of the city of Dibon in the land of Moab in the year 1868. It has been treated in monographs by Smend, Clermont-Ganneau, Nöldeke, Nordlander, and others. The text will be found in Lidzbarski's *Nordsemitische Epigraphik.*

Moabite Stone. See Mesha Inscription above.

Morphology. The science of the forms of words.

Nabunaid (or Nabonidus). Name of the last *de facto* and *de jure* king of Babylon according to the monuments; Belshazzar according to the Scriptures being the last *de facto* king.

Onkelos. Name of the author of the best Aramaic version of the books of Moses. The version is named after him.

Ostraka. Fragments of pottery on which are Hebrew, Greek, or Coptic inscriptions.

Paleography. Ancient ways of indicating words in writing, and the study or art of deciphering them.

Peshitto. See Versions.

Pointings. Signs added to the original consonantal text in order to indicate the sound or the sense of the original according to the view of the exegete or pointer.

Preformatives and Sufformatives. Semitic roots have commonly three consonantal letters. Many nouns and forms of the verb are formed from these roots by putting a consonant before or after. When placed be-

fore, the consonant is called a preformative; when after, a sufformative.

Prosthetic. A letter, commonly Aleph, prefixed to another with *e* or *a* to aid in the pronunciation. Thus in Ashtora for Shtora and in Ahasuerus the A is prosthetic.

Protasis. The clause introduced by "if," "when," "whoever," etc., upon which the main proposition depends. Thus "if you love me" is the protasis of which "ye will keep my commandments" is the apodosis.

Provenance. The locality at which any antique is found or document was written.

Pseudepigraph. A writing ascribed to one who did not write it. In works on the Canon it is commonly restricted to documents which are not in the canon of the Roman Catholics. Apocryphal are the books acknowledged by the Roman Catholics, but not by Protestants.

Pyramid Texts. *Die Pyramidentexte* is the name given to a series of Egyptian inscriptions found in the pyramids. They have been published in the *"Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptienne et assyrienne."* The first of these texts were those found in the pyramid of King Ounas the last king of the 5th dynasty. They were edited by Maspéro and published in 1882.

Radical Sounds. The three consonants used in a root are called radicals.

Recension. A text established by revision and editing, either by the author or by another. Thus, there is a longer recension of Jeremiah preserved in the Hebrew Bible and a shorter in the Greek; and there are two recensions of the ten commandments, one in Exodus xx and one in Deuteronomy v. So, there are at least two recensions of the inscription of Darius at Behistun, the longer being that contained in the Persian, of which the Elamite is apparently a translation, and

the shorter in the Babylonian which is fairly equivalent to the Aramaic. The first three are certainly and the Aramaic probably from the same time and have the same authority. Sometimes we speak of the whole four as recensions.

Redactors. Editors who put together and supplemented the original parts of the Pentateuch.

Sachau Papyri. The Sachau Papyri (or Papyrus) are Aramaic documents (mostly letters and contracts, but containing also a short edition of the Behistun inscription of Darius the Great, king of Persia, and part of a story of a man called Achikar) edited by Prof. Edouard Sachau of the University of Berlin. (See my review in the PTR for 1911.)

Samaritan. Here used for the version of the books of Moses into the Samaritan dialect of the Aramaic. This version is still used by a small number of persons residing in the modern city of Nablous.

Samaritan Version. See Versions.

Sendschirli Inscriptions. Six inscriptions in the Sendschirli dialect are published in Lidzbarski's *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*. The first of these, embracing 34 lines, is by Panammu, king of Jadi and Sam'al, and the second, third and fourth by his son Barrekeb. The others are small fragments.

Siloah Inscription. The Siloah inscription in Hebrew was found in 1880 on a wall of the conduit built by Hezekiah (Isa. xxii. 11). It is the oldest inscription of any length in the Hebrew language. See Lidzbarski: *Nordsemitische Inschriften.*

Sumerian. Name of the people who preceded the Semites in Babylon and apparently invented the system of writing afterward used by the Assyrians, Babylonians, Hittites and others.

Suras. Name for the chapters of the Koran.

Syriac. The name given to the dialect of Aramaic spoken in Mesopotamia at Edessa. The common ver-

sion is called the Syriac Peshitto, and is cited either as Peshitto, or Syriac.

Targum. There is only one targum, or translation, to the prophets in Aramaic, called the targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel. See Stenning in Encyclopedia Brittanica XXVI, 421. See also Versions.

Tel-el-Amarna Letters. The Tel-el-Amarna or El-Amarna Letters were discovered in 1888 at Tel-el Amarna in Egypt and date from the reigns of Amenhotep III and IV. They were written in cuneiform, mostly in the Babylonian language, from Babylon, Assyria, Syria, Palestine, and other countries, to the kings of Egypt, and some of them from the kings of Egypt in reply.

Tetrateuch. *Teuch* is from a word which in post-Alexandrine Greek means "book." *Penta* means "five," *hexa* "six," and *tetra* "four." It is used on page 52 for the books from Exodus to Deuteronomy inclusive.

Textus Receptus. The "received text"; the text published in our ordinary Hebrew Bibles.

Tidal. Tidal, king of nations (Gen. xiv. 1). If the Hebrew *goyim,* "nations," is a rendering of *kiššati,* it is found as a title of Shalmanassar I of Assyria about 1300 B. C. and of Ramman-Nirari his father and was probably used of his ancestors back as far at least as Asuruballit. See Schrader in The Cuneiform Library (KAT I. 9). It is used at Babylon also, of Merodach-Baladan I about 1200 B. C. *(id* III[1] 162).

If we assume that the Hebrew text comes from Kutim, the phrase "king of Kutim" is found as early as Naram-Sin, long before Hammurabi and Abraham (See Thureau-Dangin: *Sumerische und Akkadische Königinschriften,* p. 225) where we read that Sharlak, king of the Kuti, was taken by Sargani-shar-ali, and (p. 226) where something was done to the land

of the Kuti. See also p. 171, where a tablet of Lasirab king of Gutim is given.)

Translate. To give the sense, as in "praise Jehovah."

Transliterate. To give the letters of the original, as in *Alleluia.*

Versions. There are three versions of the books of Moses from the Hebrew language in which they were originally written into the Aramaic which many of the Israelites learned and spoke from some time before the time of Christ and for many centuries after. Targum is the Aramaic word for version.

Latin Vulgate. The Latin Vulgate is the translation made by Jerome from Hebrew into Latin about A. D. 400. It is the Bible used today by the Roman Catholic church. See Kaulen: *Geschichte der Vulgata,* and Berger: *La Bible Francaise au Moyen-age.*

Samaritan Version. The Samaritan version is the translation of the Samaritan Hebrew recension of the books of Moses. It is still used by the small Samaritan synagogue in Nablous in Palestine.

Syriac Peshitto. The Syriac Peshitto is the name of the version commonly used in the Syrian churches. Peshitto means simple or explained.

Vowel Signs. See Consonantal text.

Vocable. A word, or vocal sound.

Vulgate. See Versions.

Wau Conjunctive. The Hebrew conjunction *w,* meaning "and."

Wau Conversive. The Hebrew conjunction *w* "and" when used before the perfect, or imperfect form of the verb, with the power of converting the perfect into the sense of the imperfect or the imperfect into the sense of the perfect.

Zadokite Fragments. The Zadokite Fragments are the portions of a work in Hebrew supposed to have been

written about the time of Christ. See Charles: *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,* II. 785-854, and Schechter's *Documents of Jewish Sectaries.*

ABBREVIATIONS FREQUENTLY USED

CT—*Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets, etc., in the British Museum.*

H.P.J.E.D.—See *Hexateuch,* above.

KAT—*Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament,* by Eberhard Schrader.

KB—*Die Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* or Cuneiform Library (contains translations into German of the leading historical, poetical, and contractual inscriptions of the Assyrians and Babylonians).

LOT—*An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament,* by S. R. Driver.

LXX—An abbreviation for The Seventy or The Septuagint.

O. T.—Old Testament.

PSBA—*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology.*

PTR—*Princeton Theological Review.*

TSBA—*Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.*

VASD—*Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler.*

ZATW—*Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

BOOK TO BE RETURNED

JUL 2 5 1989

CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
0 0021 0022560 2

221.13
W752

Wilson, Robert Dick
AUTHOR
A scientific investigation of the Old Testament.
TITLE
16887

221.13
W752 Wilson, Robert Dick
A scientific investigation of the Old Testament.
16887